National Anti-Slavery Standard.

VOL. XVII. NO. 19. NEW YORK, SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 27, 1856. WHOLE NO. 851.

National Anti-Slavery Standard.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY, ON SATURDAY,

AT TWO DOLLARS PER ANNUM,

BY THE

AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY,

At its Office, 138 Nassau St., New York,

AND AT THE OFFICE OF THE

PENNSYLVANIA ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY,

31 *North Fifth St., Philadelphia.*

Advertisements inserted at $1 per square for the first insertion, and 25 cents for every subsequent one. For advertisements less than a square, 50 cents for each insertion.

NORRIS & JOHNSTON, PRINTERS.

Pro-Slavery.

LIBELS ON THE SOUTH.

The last number of the *Illustrated London News* has a very suggestive piece of impertinent ignorance, to which we think the present not an inappropriate time to call the attention of our readers. Writing with every opportunity for calmness and decency, far removed from the theatre of an act which it affects to condemn on account of "ruffianism," without anything whatever to excite him, and without any other interest in it than we have in the scribbler's account with his green-grocer, he applies the language of a costermonger to a gentleman who felt himself called on to cane one who had grossly insulted a senior and absent relative, and bitterly reviled a whole State, of which he was one of the representatives. To this he adds the suggestion, that the South is apparently so determined upon resenting libels upon it, and of preventing them if possible that a censorship of books and publications may soon be expected to be established there.

Now, that desperate cases require desperate remedies is a maxim as true as most others, and it may be that the South will ultimately be driven to so serious a measure of self-protection as establishing an *index expurgatorious* against Northern and English abolitionist libel, calumny and malignance. But *absit omen!* and in the meantime we beg to assure the writer to whom we are alluding, that our laws and customs already make ample provision for all the cases that appear within the range of present possibility. If he will venture to South Carolina, and there publish such a paragraph as that which has called forth this notice, he will find that, while we can circulate it and read it with cordial contempt, we have abundantly provided for the punishment of libelers whenever we choose to invoke the law. He would find, too, that any personal insolence there would be as promptly and effectively resented as in any London club, mess-room, or other pink-place of punctillio.

With these few observations addressed to that quarter, we now turn to our readers, and earnestly call upon them to consider whether the time has not arrived when our dormant laws prohibiting the circulation amongst us of abolition libels on individuals, and injurious works of all kinds, ought to be enforced, and other measures taken to prevent the extent to which it is now being carried. It is a fact that almost every other book now sent from the North, where it is possible to make it so, is used as a vehicle for misrepresentation or abuse of us; that nearly every school book, especially those used in private establishments, contains some of the poison; and something ought certainly to be done to prevent this from continuing.

The great remedy, the only true and worthy one, perhaps, we conceive to be the establishment of large publishing houses amongst us; but the time appears not yet to be fully arrived when that can be done in New Orleans, judging from the little inclination shown by capitalists to enter upon such undertakings. Yet we think they might do so with advantage. There is a general impression that the expense of carrying them on here would be much greater than it is in the North. To some extent this is true; but we conscientiously believe that, on the whole, there would be found compensations for this disadvantage. One signal one would be the superior advantages which New Orleans affords for procuring aid in the writing, editing, or translating of works in foreign languages; another, in the field which it would open for the employment of Southern, aye, and of some Northern scholars, who are now either unable to obtain it, or are obliged to pander to Abolition tastes and the interests of unscrupulous Northern publishers, and who would gladly enter the arena in which their conscience would be free for more moderate payment than the vilest of our Northern calumniators obtains; a fourth, in the increase of circulation which would be obtained in consequence of the due enforcement of existing laws prohibiting the introduction of abolition books, and the enactment of more stringent ones, if found necessary; a fifth, in the fact, that by enterprise and judicious management, they might secure the printing of school books for the whole South; and all this without at all interfering with the circulation of their publications the wide world over, any more than the interests of the South or the feelings of her citizens interfere with that of the *Illustrated London News* or *Putnam's Monthly* amongst them. There are others, too; but as we are at present only throwing out a few suggestions on the subject, we do not enter into them.

In the meantime, until steps be taken in this direction, we call upon the citizens of the South to say whether the existing laws to which we have alluded ought not to be enforced? Ought not others, where necessary, to be enacted, to prevent Northern fanatics and publishers from resting secure in the notion that through our booksellers they can insult, libel and slander us to our teeth, with impunity, and through teachers and school books villify us, mock us, and traduce us to our children? Ought not our booksellers to be well satisfied immediately to return to the North all such objectionable publications, foisted on them without their being cognizant of their character, under laws existing or to be enacted for the purpose? We believe that none of them could object to this, even on plausible grounds, and if they did, who doubts that it would be a fully sufficient answer to remind them that their possible personal interests must yield to those of the whole community? For our parts, we do not, but affirm it with all emphasis.—*N. O. Picayune.*

FREE SOILISM IN MARYLAND—THE RICHMOND PRESS WHIPPING IN THE BALTIMOREANS.

From The Richmond (Va.) Enquirer, September 7.

BALTIMORE!—THE CITY OF BALTIMORE!—AN EYE TO BALTIMORE!

We are looking so intently at the North and non-slaveholding States, that we are apt to *overlook enemies to our peace and prosperity in our very trenches*, more dangerous far than those farther off. Maryland is now the only doubtful one of the slave States, and the vote of Maryland depends on the city of Baltimore. An election of Mayor is soon to come off in the city, and on its result the Presidential election may hang. It is important, then, to know how to calculate on Baltimore. How does she stand—for the Constitution and the Union, or against them? *Pro-slavery or anti-slavery?*—for us of the South or against us? Not to be for us is against us.

How does Baltimore stand? A few years ago, she was largely Democratic even against the vote of the State of which she is the seat of commerce. Of late years she has gone over to the enemy, under the lead of that worst ism of Demonism, called Know-Nothingism! She is now joined to Demonism against Democracy. This is partly owing to a paradox that "where Catholics are strongest they are weakest." They are numerous enough in Baltimore and Maryland to excite Protestant ire, but not numerous enough to deter its wrongs. This was one of the causes of the success of "Sam" in the State of Howard and Carroll. But there are other causes. Her geographical position, her longest line of boundary being coterminous with non-slaveholding territory, and her narrow territorial limits making the escape of fugitives easy, *forbid her being a slaveholding State with safety or profit, save in a few of her southern Counties. The consequence is, that a large majority of her population are non-slaveholders from the necessity of their location.*

Baltimore, with 20,000 inhabitants, has less than 7,000 slaves. The condition of that city and the State of Maryland in part accounts for Seward's boast at Albany, that "Free Soilism is stronger on the shores of the Chesapeake Bay, surrounded by slavery, than on the shores of San Francisco, surrounded by Free Soilism itself." The politics of Maryland were Whig, the majority of her religions Protestant, and this may account for her being anti-Democratic and Know-Nothing. But this will not account for the just cause of doubt and distrust as to her course in this critical and decisive Presidential election. Pro-slavery and anti-slavery are now opposed to each other in hostile sectional array.

It is useless to pretend that Maryland prefers Fillmore—that Baltimore goes for "Americans ruling America." That humbug is exposed. The real issue is African slavery or its abolition! A vote for Fillmore now in the South is more than half a vote for Fremont and anti-slavery. A vote now in Maryland against Democracy is a whole vote for Demonism—for disunion, and against the Constitution and laws! How, then, stand the Baltimore merchants and men of means and influence? Maryland's leading Whig politicians have come out from the isms, and show clearly where honour and interest point the way to all men identified with both in slavery. *Where are the Baltimore merchants?* All of them depend almost entirely on the Southern trade and the products of slave labour. Are they labouring to promote Demonism, or to destroy Democracy—which? *We must hold all to a strict scrutiny*, and we recur to some facts which are noted here, and which call for attention from the whole South.

First—Baltimore has become the centre of the Methodist Church, pro and anti-slavery divisions, the very fulcrum of the lever agitation which most effectually reaches the homes and masters of slaves. In the Baltimore Conference the secret was disclosed, that the union of the members North and South is kept up upon the principle that it brings Abolition near enough to strike slavery in the fifth rib; that it lulls suspicion by coming from a slave city; that it can reach Virginia when nothing from Philadelphia or New York can do so as fatally.

Second—The non-slaveholding traders from Maryland and Virginia, in shallops on the bay, are met at the wharves in Baltimore by all the anti-slavery agents there, and it was through them that so many of this class were caught in Saul's net spread for them in that city.

Third—It is notorious that Mr. Wise, in his canvass, felt the influence of Baltimore in various sections of Virginia, particularly in the Northern Neck, on the eastern shore and on the line of the Baltimore and Ohio railroad, more against Democracy and slavery than he felt from any Northern source, and the influence of that city on the vote of Virginia was greater than all her own towns put together, saving and excepting their votes. Baltimore had sent more agents and more money than they all had. Her most active and mighty exertions were made against the election of Mr. Wise. It is felt, and is remembered by the Virginia Democracy, and was alarming to Virginia slaveholders.

Fourth—A renegade from Virginia, Henry Winter Davis, was nominated for Congress from Baltimore, with a full knowledge of the fact that his opinions on the subject of slavery were at least suspicious—and, notwithstanding his doubtful position, he was elected by a large majority over one of the truest and most talented Southern Democrats, Henry May, Esq.; and since his election he has given two votes, one on the election of a Black Republican Speaker, and the other on the revolutionary question of the Army Appropriation bill, which prove conclusively his Free Soil proclivities. These votes, if not approved, have certainly never been publicly reprobated by those who elected him. Indeed, it is said and believed, that several of his Know-Nothing Councils have, since these votes, passed resolutions approving of his whole course.

These facts justify the inference that the city of Baltimore is as deeply dyed in Free Soilism, and as destitute of sympathy with the South, as Philadelphia or New York. And if this inference is well-founded and correctly drawn, *Baltimore must be counted as not for us but against us.* We must deal with her as with the other more Northern cities, all sectional enemies who are assailing our domestic peace and property, and our perpetuity as a free and equal Confederacy of States. *Baltmore, if she goes along with the North, must take the consequence and not be benefitted by the patronage of the South.* We must not make "fish of one and flesh of another." Our enemies in the slave States are the most dangerous. It is a question of vital interest—who is with us?

First—We beg our friends in Baltimore to publish, from time to time, the *names of those merchants, traders and business men, of all vocations, who are pro-slavery.*

Second—We ask our Southern dealers of all classes, to note *who are friends and who are foes in Baltimore.*

Third—We ask our towns, villages and country places in the South to organize meetings, publicly to pledge their patronage to such only in all the cities, Baltimore included, as are known friends of constitutional protection to property in slaves; of State equality in the territories; of the Union of the States; and who are not Abolitionists and Free Soilers.

Fourth—We ask the whole Southern press, friendly to our views, to call attention to this matter, and to rouse their readers to the necessity of this course of self-protection.

Fifth—We ask our friends in Baltimore and all the Northern cities, to organize and procure and publish reliable information on which our traders and buyers may act.

The South is affiliating on this and other points of action, and if we have not a majority of friends in the North, the minority who are our friends shall be strengthened by our patronage for the protection they are willing to give to our rights of property and to our political equality in the Union.

Selections.

A LETTER FROM GOVERNOR REEDER ON DEMOCRACY.

New York City, September 18, 1856.

To the Editors of The Evening Post.

Gentlemen: The letter of your correspondent H., and your editorial comments upon it of the 16th inst., seem in common courtesy to demand a reply. Your correspondent does not err in saying that I desire the success of the Republican party and the election of their candidate, and that I am ready to contribute any honourable effort to bring it about. This is not the result of any preference as to men, but in spite of it. With Colonel Fremont I am unacquainted. I have never seen him, nor had any communication with him, direct or indirect, verbal or written. On the other hand, my feelings of friendship and admiration for Mr. Buchanan, as a man, are of ordinary character, and are strengthened by years of friendly intimacy and reciprocal acts of kindness, uninterrupted to this time by a single misunderstanding or unpleasant feeling; and I would at any time defend him promptly and indignantly against personal attacks upon his reputation. I believe him to be a man of distinguished ability, of high integrity and valuable experience. He is surrounded, too, in Pennsylvania by many political friends, whom personally I love and esteem, and to whom I am united by ties of long-cherished political and social intimacy, and the loss of whose friendship I should regard as a great calamity. For more than a quarter of a century I have steadily laboured with the Democratic party, and never doubted that I should do so during my life. For years I have exerted myself to bring about Mr. Buchanan's nomination. In 1848 and 1852 I was one of those who carried for him the delegates of our district, and was his ardent supporter. On each occasion I was in the National Convention as one of his delegates.

These ties are exceedingly strong and hard to sever, especially with one who is naturally of a conservative cast, and slow to change old habits of thought and action; and I have resisted for months the convictions that were urging me to my present declaration. I have diligently sought reasons and arguments to save myself the pain of breaking up old associations and alienating myself from old friends, but all in vain. My love of country and hatred of oppression would not allow my feelings and inclinations either to delude my judgment or still my conscience, and I am compelled to forfeit my self-respect by committing what I believe to be palpably wrong, or else to enrol myself in opposition to the Democratic party.

I can see no reasonable hope of justice and sympathy for the people of Kansas in the success of the Democracy. In its ranks, and with the power to control its action, are found the border ruffians of Missouri and their accomplices of the South, who have trampled upon the Constitution and all the essential principles of our Government, robbed Kansas of its civil liberty and right of suffrage, laid waste its territory with fire and sword, and repudiated even civilization itself.

In its platform I find the enunciation of principles which would put the rope about the necks of men for exercising the constitutional right of petitioning Congress for a State government, as a redress of grievances far worse than those which led to the war of the Revolution, and a declaration stigmatising as "armed resistance to law" the moderate and justifiable self-defence of men shamefully and infamously oppressed by ruffian violence and outrage, beyond all human endurance.

I find the whole party of the nation assembled in National Convention, with but one individual dissent, expressing its "unqualified admiration" of an Administration which has lent itself as the tool and accomplice of all the wrongs inflicted upon Kansas, and by its venality and imbecility brought the country to an intestine war.

I find in all its representatives in Congress, with three individual exceptions, labouring in earnest zeal, by speech and vote, to cover up the iniquities of this Administration and the border ruffians of Missouri, and to suppress a fair investigation of outrages which shock both humanity and republicanism, and defy the Constitution and the laws.

I find these same representatives, after the truth was elicited in spite of their efforts, still refusing to relieve the people from a code of laws imposed upon them by a foreign army, and still refusing to admit them into the Union, only for reasons which, in the cases of nine existing States, had been declared untenable and of no account.

I find them disregarding a free constitution adopted in a legal, constitutional and time-sanctioned manner (and which no man can doubt to have reflected the will of the people), and supporting a law to produce a substitute, which it is easy to show would have perpetuated in the State government the usurpation which had by force already seized upon the government of the territory.

I find them refusing to make appropriations for the army unless that army is to be used to enforce a code of laws violative, on their face, of the Constitution, enacted by a legislature in violation of the law of the United States, and imposed by foreign force upon conquered and subjugated American citizens.

I find them, in a word, steadily aiding by all their Congressional action to make a slave State in Northern latitude, and that, too, against the will of its inhabitants.

I find that one member who more than any other stood out against the enslavement of his white fellow-citizens, is refused a renominatian by the Democratic party of his district.

I find in the canvass now going on that the whole tone of their party press is in the same direction. When the first startling intelligence of the outrages in Kansas reached the States, their editors denounced the foul wrong in fitting indignation. It was but a spasmodic effort, however, and in deference to the South and the prevailing sentiment of the party, they have dropped off, one after the other, until now, so far as I have been able to ascertain, there is not a Democratic paper which dares boldly to justify and defend the Free State party, and denounce their invaders. In place of encouragement and sympathy for their outraged fellow-citizens from the North, there is little else than jeers and ridicule for their oppressed and suffering condition—misrepresentation of their motives and conduct, and a pretended incredulity of the statements and appeals which they send to their brethren of the States.

I find their speakers exhibiting the same spirit—some of them ignoring the question entirely; others of them treating it with perversions, misrepresentations and false issues; and others taking openly the side of the oppressors; but no one of them advocating the cause of Kansas, or favouring her admission under the Free State Constitution adopted by her people.

In the public demonstrations and processions of the party, I find banners and devices containing brutal insults, in response to the appeals of that people for protection against unparalleled wrongs, calculated, as no doubt they must be intended, to prepare the masses for a continued refusal of justice and protection, and a relentless persistence in outrage and oppression.

I find all the Democrats South, and a portion of the Democracy of the North, boldly repudiating the Kansas-Nebraska bill, by insisting that slavery has a right to go into the Territories, in spite of Congress or the people; and that the inhabitants of the Territory have no right to pass territorial laws to forbid it or exclude it. Democratic representatives from Pennsylvania even, in the Senate and the House, hold and proclaim these opinions, whilst other representatives from Pennsylvania, with Democratic leaders from other States, declare themselves publicly to be non-committal upon this heresy; the inevitable tendency of which, it is easy to show, will be to prevent almost entirely the formation of any more free States.

Having originated a movement myself, to aid our people by sending them men and money, and having prosecuted it with the strictest avoidance of party character, and a studied neutrality as to the political canvass, and having earnestly asked the cooperation of men of all parties, I have failed to enlist in it, to my knowledge, a single Democrat. In the Conventions of Cleveland and Buffalo, called without distinction of party, in furtherance of this enterprise, there was no Democrat present but myself. This cannot have been from any want of generosity or of means, but only in deference to the prevailing tone and sentiment of the party, which is enlisted upon the other side of the question. And not only have they abstained from aiding the movement, but in their presses and by their private influence they have endeavoured to cripple and retard it by sneering at it, warning the community against it as treasonable, and declaring that the money would be misapplied, thus endeavouring to prevent contributions even from friends of the measure.

I might go on with this catalogue and enumerate other indications, if necessary, showing that the prevailing tone of the party is hostile to Kansas; but I consider it only necessary to add, that what I have said relates but to the North. The South, where the great mass of the party is to be found, makes no pretension, as a whole, to the advocacy of anything but pure border-ruffianism.

What, then, have the Free State men of Kansas to expect from a Democratic Administration, even if presided over by Mr. Buchanan? If he could be left to act upon his own impulses, unaffected by external influences, and free from all pledges and obligations, express and implied, the case would be very different. But, unfortunately, this is not so. His election would rightfully be considered a decision against us, whatever may be his own private feelings. His offices at Washington, in Kansas and elsewhere, would necessarily, to a large extent, be filled with our enemies. His information would come through a distorted medium; and lastly, he could not aid us without having first made up his own party. The South would charge him with violating his pledges, and turn upon him with the bitterest hostility, and at least a portion of the Northern Democracy would follow their example. He would thus be left without a party to support his administration, unless he should cast himself into the arms of the Republicans. We cannot, it seems to me, either ask or expect to do this upon a question where party lines are so plainly drawn before his election. Like all other men in the same situation, he must obey the party sentiment on which he is elected. That there are Democrats in Pennsylvania who are full of indignation against the conduct of the South in regard to Kansas, I am well aware, and that they would use their influence to redress her wrongs, I am well satisfied; but they are too few in proportion to the whole party of the Union to sustain his Administration in a war with his party. They have as yet been unable to make their opinions appear and be felt in the party, and, of course, cannot do so hereafter. I honour their good intentions, but I cannot believe in their power.

I repeat that I have been forced to these conclusions after no slight struggle with my feelings and inclinations. Should Mr. Buchanan be elected, and his administration be different from what my judgment compels me to believe, I shall give it my cordial approbation, and my feeble though willing support. As I believe now, I must regard the Democratic party as fully committed to Southern sectionalism, towards which, for some time past, it has been rapidly tending, and I quit it, well assured that my duty to my country demands at my hands this sacrifice of personal feeling.

Very truly yours, A. H. Reeder.

THE MISSOURI COMPROMISE—HOW CLAY MADE IT.

From The National Intelligencer.

Albemarle, Va., Sept. 2, 1856.

Dear Sirs: In a conversation a few days since with a Representative in Congress from this State, allusion being made to a letter of Mr. Clay to my late brother, Wm. S. Woods, giving the part which he had taken in bringing about the *Missouri Compromise*, considerable anxiety was expressed that the letters might be published; and I herewith inclose to you, his ever-constant and devoted friends, the original, that you may do with it as you think proper.

Yours, most truly,

John R. Woods.

Messrs. Gales & Seaton, Washington.

Ashland, July 16, 1835.

Dear Sir: I have duly received your note of the 8th instant, and feel greatly obliged by the friendly sentiments and the constancy with which you have adhered towards me. I regret extremely that I can supply you with no copy of any speech that I ever made on the Missouri question. The debate was long, arduous, and, during the last agitation of the question, I spoke almost every day for two or three weeks on the main or collateral questions. The set or prepared speech which I made of three or four hours' duration was never published. Of my share in the debate, there is, therefore, only a meagre account to be gleaned from the papers of the day.

The question first arose in the session of 1819–'20. When the bill for admitting Missouri into the Union was on its passage, Mr. Taylor, of New York, proposed to insert in it, as a condition on which the State was to become a member of the Confederacy, that it should never tolerate slavery or involuntary servitude. The argument by which that proposition was maintained by himself and others was, that slavery is contrary to the Divine law and to the acknowledged rights of man; that it ought not to exist; that it is an admitted evil; that, if the General Government cannot extirpate it in the old States, it can prevent its extension to the new; that, being contracted within a limited sphere, it will be less pernicious and more controllable; that Congress, having the power to admit new States, may prescribe the conditions of their admission; and that in all preceding instances of the admission of new States some conditions were annexed.

To all this we replied that the general Government had nothing to do with the subject of slavery, which belonged exclusively to the several States; that they alone were to judge of the evil and the remedy; that every State had such entire control over the matter that those which tolerated slavery might abolish it, and those which never had it, or had abolished it, might now admit it without any interference from the general Government; that although Congress had the power to admit new States, when admitted, by the express terms of the Constitution, they were on the same footing in every respect whatever with the senior States, and consequently had a right to judge for themselves on the question of slavery; that, if Congress could exercise the power of annexing a condition respecting slavery, they might annex any other condition, and thus it might come to pass that, instead of a confederacy of States of equal power, we should exhibit a mongrel association; that in the case of other new States, they were not conditions upon their sovereignty, but voluntary compacts, relating chiefly to the public lands and mutually beneficial; that the extension of slavery was favorable to the comfort of the slave and to the security of the white race, &c.

The proposition by Mr. Taylor (which I think had been made at the previous session) was defeated by a small majority, and the bill passed without the obnoxious condition.

Missouri assembled her Convention, formed a Constitution, and transmitted it to Congress. In that Constitution she unfortunately asserted a clause against free blacks; and when, at the session of 1820–'21, it was proposed to admit her into the Union, the same party who had supported the condition, taking advantage of that exceptionable clause, now opposed her admission.

I did not reach Washington until January, and when I got there I found the members from the slave States and some from others in despair. All efforts had been tried and failed to reconcile the parties. Mr. Lowndes had exhausted all his great resources in vain. *Both parties appealed to me, and, after surveying their condition, I went to work.* I saw that each was so committed and so wedded to its opinion that nothing could be effected without a compromise; and the point with me was *to propose some compromise which should involve no sacrifice of principle.* I got a Committee of thirteen appointed by the House, and furnished to the Speaker (Mr. Taylor) a list of such members as I wished, embracing enough of the restrictionists to carry any measure, if they would agree with us. In that Committee *I proposed*, and, with its assent, reported to the House a clause, by way of condition, to be annexed to the act admitting her, *substantially like that which was finally adopted.* It was defeated in the House by Mr. Randolph and Messrs. Edwards and Burton, of North Carolina, voting against it.

My next movement was to get a joint Committee of 24 appointed by the two Houses. That on the part of the House was chosen by ballot, and a list which I made out were appointed, with a few exceptions. They reported the resolution, now to be found on the statue book, which was finally passed March 2, 1821, and *settled the question.*

Never did a party put so much at hazard as the restrictionists did on so small a question as that was which arose on the second occasion, growing out of the Constitution of Missouri. Never have I seen the Union in such danger. Mr. King, of New-York, was understood to concur in all the measures of the restrictionists. He was a member of the Senate, spoke largely on the subject, and was most triumphantly refuted in one of the ablest speeches of Mr. Pinkney, of Maryland, that I ever heard.

Besides the topics employed in the first instance, on this second occasion the main effort of our opponents was procrastination; they urging that the matter should be put off until the new Congress. We believed that their real purpose was to consolidate their party and to influence the Presidential election then approaching. I never was in better health and spirits, and never worried my opponents more. I coaxed, soothed, scorned, defied them by turns, as I thought the best effect was to be produced. Towards those, of whom they were many from the free States, anxious for the settlement of the controversy I employed all the persuasion and conciliation in my power.

At the conclusion of the business I was exhausted; and I am perfectly satisfied that I could not have borne three weeks more of such excitement and exertions.

This account of that memorable question is written for your own satisfaction, and not for publication. It is the first draught, and I retain no copy.

Your letter has brought on you a great infliction in this long epistle. You must ascribe it to the friendly feeling excited by yours. I rarely commit this sort of offence.

With great respect,

I am yours, faithfully, H. Clay.

Wm. S. Woods, Esq.,

ORIGIN OF THE CONSPIRACY TO MAKE KANSAS A SLAVE STATE—INTERESTING HISTORY.

From The Chicago Tribune.

The plot by which Kansas was to be made a slave State, by violence and fraud if necessary, originated, we repeat, in the wicked heart of D. R. Atchison, *at a time when he supposed that the repeal of the Missouri Compromise was impossible.* Its first development which was made public, we find in the *Platte Argus*, a Western Missouri paper. In the Fall of 1853, a public meeting was held in Platte County, in which Mr. Atchison was the presiding spirit. It was called for the purpose of taking into consideration the affairs of Kansas, then not named, and almost a year before the passage of the Nebraska bill, when the population was made up only of Indians and Indian traders. *Mr. Atchison addressed the meeting, and probably wrote the resolutions.* The first of these expressed an opinion adverse to the propriety of opening the Territory to settlement. The second declared that if it were opened, the Missouri Compromise should be repealed. The language of another resolution we give:

Resolved, That if the Territory shall be opened to settlement, we pledge ourselves to each other to *extend the institutions of Missouri over the Territory, at whatever sacrifice of blood or treasure.*

This, be it remembered, *was long before the project of repealing the Compromise was agitated*, and while Mr. Douglas yet believed that the Compromise was a "sacred thing which no ruthless hand would disturb." At this same meeting a plot was elaborated, by which Kansas, if opened, *was to be conquered to slavery in any event, and it is remarkable that the plan is almost identical with that which the Ruffians have carried out.* The nature of it was this: "If the Compromise were not repealed, and the Territory were opened to settlement under it, a State Government was to be early organized, as were the Governments, respectively, of Arkansas, Michigan and Tennessee, and the Missourians were, at 'whatever sacrifice of blood and treasure,' to control, as they have since done, the Convention and the Legislature." The proceedings of this meeting at that time attracted little attention; and but from the significance given them by subsequent events, they would have been forgotten.

After this demonstration, we lost sight of the intention to introduce slavery into Kansas, but the probabilities are that this meeting was the origin of the Blue Lodges in Missouri and the South, about which we have since heard so much. Mr. Atchison went to the South, and when Mr. Douglas brought forward his measure for organizing the Territory, without a clause repealing the Compromise, *he compelled the Illinois Senator to come to his terms.* We hear no more of him, his office—President of the Senate, and *ex-officio* Vice-President of the United States—holding him in check.

We next find the Blue Lodge organized and in full blast. Before the passage of the Douglas bill, which became a law June 30, 1854; before the organization of the Emigrant Aid Society, which held its first meeting July 30, 1854, Mr. Jordan Danison, a Missourian and Border Ruffian, swore before the Kansas Congressional Committee that *he was in a Blue Lodge at Pleasant Hill, Missouri, in February*, 1854, *and that the object of the Society was to make Kansas a slave State.*

Next we have the resolutions of a public meeting held at Parkville, Mo., published in the Parkville *Luminary*, June 10, 1854, before the Kansas bill was passed—before the Emigrant Aid Society was organized—at which the following resolutions were passed:

8. Resolved. That we recognise the institution of slavery as *already existing in the Territory*, and recommend to slaveholders to introduce their property as fast as possible.

9. Resolved, That we afford protection to no Abolitionists as settlers in Kansas Territory.

On the same day the resolutions were passed by a meeting on Salt Creek, K. T., and, on the 8th July (before the Aid Society was organized), they were reaffirmed by a squatter meeting at Rockbridge, K. T. On the 24th of June (more than a month before a man had come from Massachusetts) these same resolutions were passed by a meeting at Whitehead.

Are not these facts conclusive? Could a clearer case be made out?

BROOKS'S CONTEMPLATED BOOTY.

From The Philadelphia Bulletin.

When Col. Preston S. Brooks, with the flower of South Carolina chivalry, marches to Washington and seizes the archives and the Treasury (our readers will excuse us from quoting the blasphemous conclusions of the programme) he undoubtedly expects that he may get something handsome. "The Treasury" sounds like something enormous, and we can fancy the delightful revellings of the South Carolinians in imaginary vaults heaped up with gold and silver. But the real Treasury at Washington, under our present financial system, which has always been approved by the constituents of Colonel Brooks, is quite a different thing. Cash never accumulates in it to any great amount. The public funds are generally to be found in the depositaries where they are collected in the shape of customs duties, receipts for public lands, post office revenue, &c. The largest receipts of this kind, unfortunately for Col. Brooks and his army, are at the Northern cities. The North pays the bulk of the duties, writes and pays for most of the letters, and buys the greater part of the public lands. So the money accumulates in the Northern cities, and remains there till government often has to transfer large sums from the North to the South, to pay for mail service, or fortifications, or public buildings and other expenses which the actual revenue of the South cannot afford to pay.

Suppose that Col. Brooks and his army had marched to Washington city on the 25th day of August, 1856, instead of the 4th of March, 1857, as they contemplate doing. In seizing the Treasury they would have got, according to the last statement of the United States Treasurer, exactly $72,722 57; for that was all the cash the government happened to have on hand at Washington on that day, though in its various boxes throughout the country, it had nearly twenty-five millions. This sum of $72,722 57 would not have gone very far with the army of Col. Brooks, and "the archives" would not have brought a very handsome sum in a Southern market. They might, then, it is true, turn to the various Southern depositaries of the public funds, and let us see what they would get there. The same statement from which we have already quoted shows that on the 25th of August there was at the credit of the Treasurer in all the depositories, the sum of $24,898,778 49, of which 4,016,061 32 was in Southern and $20,882,117 17 in Northern States, as follows:

SOUTHERN DEPOSITARIES.	
U. S. Treasury, Washington	$ 72,722 57
Asst. Treasurer, Charleston	47,294 00
" " New Orleans	495,141 52
" " St. Louis	1,312,612 37
Depositary at Baltimore	426,500 95
" Richmond	29,712 93
" Norfolk	18,429 42
" Wilmington, N. C.	540 47
" Savannah	82,936 94
" Mobile	24,591 27
" Nashville	4,888 24
" Galveston	4,664 38
" Little Rock	44,326 92
" Tallahassee	944 50
Branch Mint at Charlotte	32,000 00
" " Dalonega	27,950 03
" " New Orleans	1,691,004 71
Total	$4,016,061 32

NORTHERN DEPOSITARIES.	
Asst. Treasurer, Boston	$ 2,943,234 94
" " New York	9,363,515 64
" " Philadelphia	641,283 21
" " San Francisco	757,026 49
Depositary at Buffalo	413 37
" Cincinnati	34,359 46
" " (late)	20 39
" Pittsburg	22,361 46
" Dubuque	274,363 93
" Chicago	179,362 67
" Detroit	132,321 45
Assay Office, N. Y.	2,244,500 00
U. S. Mint, Philadelphia	3,092,354 16
Branch Mint, San Francisco	1,200,000 00
Total	$20,882,117 17

This statement gives a tolerably fair view of the average distribution of the public funds. If there is to be any seizure of the public treasure, the North will have decidedly the best of the game. As about four-fifths of the revenue is collected at the North, it usually lies there till wanted. We do not publish it in any boastful spirit; but lest some sensible Southern people, out of South Carolina, might be tempted by the prospect of booty held out in the threatened seizure of the Treasury at Washington, we have thought it proper to state the sum that they might expect to find there.

JEFFERSON'S LAST WORDS ON SLAVERY.

The world is familiar with Jefferson's repeatedly-expressed opinions in favour of the ultimate abolition of slavery in the Southern States. In his *Notes on Virginia*, in his private correspondence, in his original draft of the Declaration of Independence, in the Ordinance of 1787, and elsewhere, his sentiments on this subject were freely and earnestly uttered. The Chicago *Democratic Press* publishes the following correspondence—furnished by a son of the gentleman by whom the first letter is signed—which shows that Jefferson's opinion remained unchanged to the last:

"Middleton, April 20, 1826.

"Aged and Honoured Sir: Permit a man, a native of Virginia, an admirer of your character, who feels an interest in your fame, and who always has eagerly laid hold of everything that ever escaped your pen as political or moral perfection—I say, permit such a man to occupy a few minutes of your precious and remaining time. It has for many years been conjectured that you would favour the world, at some period, with a political treatise, having for one object, *the emancipation of slaves.* If heaven, in mercy to the blacks, safety to the whites, and unfading honour to your great name and fame, should so move you to leave *one single page* to that effect, many of your friends and devoted political disciples believe it would have a more certain, permanent, calm, and irresistible effect than any and all things written and said thereon during the existence of the American Government.

"I am well aware that to ask you to write to me your detailed opinion on the subject would be improper, and to write you a tedious letter would be impertinent. But my zeal on the subject, together with a long-confirmed opinion of the goodness of your heart and rectitude of your head, had emboldened me to pray of you to give me *two lines* expressive of the probability of your leaving for the world your thoughts on that subject. I fear in making this request I may be censured for impertinence. If, however, I am in any way, I beg forgiveness, and whatever may be the fate of this my request, I shall die as I have lived, the undeviated friend of the good name, fame, and character of Jefferson. Jas. Heaton."

"Monticello, May 26, 1826.

"Dear Sir: The subject of your letter of April 20, is one on which I do not permit myself to express an opinion, but when time, place, and occasion may give it some favourable effect. A good cause is often injured more by ill-timed efforts of its friends than by the arguments of its enemies. Persuasion, perseverance and patience are the best advocates on questions depending on the will of others. *The revolution in public opinion which this case requires, is not to be expected in a day, or perhaps in an age; but time, which outlives all things, will outlive this evil also. My sentiments have been forty years before the public*, and had I repeated them forty times, they would only become the more stale and threadbare. Although I shall not live to see them consummated, they will not die with me; but *living or dying, they will ever be my most fervent prayers.* This is written for yourself and not for the public, in compliance with your request of two lines of sentiment on the subject. Accept the assurance of my good will and respect. Thos. Jefferson.

"Mr. Jas. Heaton, Middleton, Ohio."

CONSEQUENCES OF THREATENED DISUNION.

It is time for the inhabitants of New York and New England to consider their position in reference to the possible realization of the age-long menaces of secession on the part of the Southern States, and to estimate their resources as a distinct and independent people.

Neither New York nor New England derives any commercial or pecuniary benefit from their political connection with the Southern States. The trade between the two sections was not caused by the Federal Union, and is in no way dependent no it. A dissolution of the Union would rather increase than diminish the overwhelming commercial preponderance of the North. The Federal Government furnishes to Southern ports every facility for foreign traffic which could be possessed under any system; and every effort which pride, jealousy and envious hostility could prompt, has always been made by the Southerners to carry on a direct trade with Europe—with no other result than a continual diminution of Southern tonnage, and a decay of the foreign commerce of every place south of Baltimore. The causes of this are entirely independent of all political agency, and are wholly beyond the control of the people of the country.

Canada and British America generally hold precisely the same relation to New York and New England, and are compelled to rely almost wholly on New York and New England for their imports from the mother country as well as from the rest of the world. Every year the shipping and ocean trade of Montreal, Quebec, and the whole St. Lawrence are dwindling; and they are now less than half of what they were six years ago. The British Government communicates with Canada only through Portland, Boston and New York.

Does any one imagine that a Federal Union between Canada and New York would increase that commercial dependence of the former on the latter? Or would it be in any respect more advantageous to either? And why is the Southern trade supposed to be involved in the political relations of the free and the slave States?

Commerce is not dependent upon any such conditions, political or moral. Britain, France and Germany are unanimously anti-slavery—holding in unqualified abhorrence the peculiar institutions of the Southern States. And, as the slaveholders delight in showing the complete dependence of the North on them for cotton and tobacco, and in menacing the total withdrawal of their supplies of these commodities as the inevitable though unaccountable consequences of secession and disunion, it would be well to demonstrate the mode in which the ruin of Northern commerce is to be effected. Let the South now unanimously resolve that not one pound of cotton or tobacco shall be sent to Great Britain, or to any country where anti-slavery or "Abolitionist" sentiment prevail. This ought to have been tried long ago—and would have been done—if it could.

It is not in the power of any being to mention one commercial privilege or pecuniary advantage derived by the North from its political connection with the South. The Southern people already are doing all in their power to injure the Northern States, and eagerly avail themselves of every division of parties in Congress, and of every opportunity presenting in the course of Federal legislation to deprive the North of those benefits which the Constitution was expressly formed to secure to all. Were the Southern States actually thrust out of the Union (the only way of getting them out)—were New York and New England but fairly clear of the hideous incumbrance of the whole slaveholding tribe thus bound upon their backs, and were left in perfect political independence, retaining only a friendly understanding with each other and with the great North-West—the sixty millions of dollars which the North now annually pays for the convenience, defence, and increase of regions, foreign in spirit and character, and malignantly hostile in disposition as in action—would be saved, and appropriated where the money belongs.

New York imports annually from foreign countries "goods, wares, merchandise, etc., etc.," to the amount of $195,427,933. It did so in 1854; and in the same year the New England States imported the value of $52,298,421; while the imports of all the other States of the Union together amounted to no more than $53,770,740; New York and New England unitedly importing $247,726,354.

The annual exports of New York to foreign parts

hardly be imagined that any difference could be made in the exercise of powers so similar to each other, yet from the earliest action of Congress a difference was demanded by and acceded to the slaveholding interest; and while the surrender of the fugitive from justice was left entirely with the State authorities, that of fugitives from services was left entirely with the State authorities, that of fugitives from services was conferred on the officers of the General Government. Some of the States desired to regulate the exercise of the power within their own borders, and on their own citizens, and passed laws for that purpose; yet the Supreme Court of the United States, whose members owe their appointments to the Executive, and whose presiding Judge has for more than fifty-five years been taken from a slaveholding State, declared such laws and all State interference unconstitutional. And the second Fugitive Slave law carried out the principle by prohibiting all State interference. It went further, and conceded still more to the Pro-Slavery interest, for it virtually denied to our citizens any appeal to our own courts in defence of their freedom, and compelled them to resort to the tribunals of the State to which transported, thus affording us a practical illustration of the evil complained of in 1776—that of "transporting us beyond seas to be tried for pretended offences;" and it crowned its concessions to that interest by allowing to the judicial officers of the United States for sending a man into slavery twice the compensation allowed for setting him free.

By the legislation also the area of slavery has been enlarged. Confined in the first instance to the bounds of the original thirteen States, it was by the Missouri Compromise extended far beyond those limits, and now by the repeal of that Compromise the whole territory of the nation is claimed to be open to it.

So too it was by legislation that Texas was admitted to the Union as a slaveholding State, and now, with her 60,000 slaves, adds her voice to the cry which ascends to Heaven from the land which once proclaimed to man his inalienable right to be free.

Not content, however, with the augmentation of the number of slaves, the increase of slave territory, the possession of political power, and the interposition of the Legislative authority, the slaveholding interest has of late years resorted to violence for the extension of its domain.

Early in the history of our Government the idea was started in a slaveholding State that if the General Government should be deemed to have exceeded its constitutional power, it was competent for an individual State to refuse obedience to its laws. Supported by a President from the same State, that doctrine became an acknowledged principle of the dominant political party of the Union. And only a few years have elapsed since we beheld the practical operation of the doctrine in the nullification and secession movements of another slaveholding State.

And now, day by day, we behold how sternly is denied to even the freemen of the South to question whether "Slavery is a great good!"

Our own citizens visiting there are captured and mobbed, or driven from the territory, if they venture even to hint a doubt of its propriety.

The minister of the Gospel who ventures to preach God's freedom there is silenced.

The schoolmaster who dares attempt to instruct the blinded ignorance there surrounding him, and the bookseller who distributes a word for Freedom, are forcibly expelled.

The citizen who associates in convention with those who proclaim the great principles of Freedom which we profess is driven from his family and his home.

The editor who, in the exercise of the freedom of the Press, discusses the matter ever so temperately, is beaten with many stripes.

Free men, for assisting to break the fetters of the slave, are consigned for long years to the gloom and the suffering of the penitentiary.

In violation of the Constitution, which declares that for any speech or debate in either House of Congress the Senators and Representatives shall not be questioned in any other place, a Senator is cruelly beaten for words spoken in debate.

And even in the land of Sumpter and of Marion, the perpetrator of the cowardly outrage is feasted and lauded, and led in triumphal procession by the whole people.

And to crown all, the citizens of the free States, for exercising the right of removing to territory common to all, are hunted like beasts of prey from their houses, driven to fly by the fire of their own dwellings, and are imprisoned and shot to death with a ruthless disregard to humanity and justice.

These repeated aggressions have been borne by the free people of our country for nearly a three-quarters of a century, in the confident hope—once strong, but now weak—that the time would come when the cause of these evils would cease in the land; that our fellow-citizens of the South would pause in their invasion alike of our feelings and our rights; and that peace and harmony would abide with us all. But how vain and illusory is the hope!

Day by day there comes up to us from the far distant borders of our land the sound of civil war, engendered in behalf of slavery. Even in the Halls of Congress is uttered the threat of our subjugation by this interest of eternal aggression.

An Administration, inaugurated on the promise of repose, takes the lead even in agitation. Others are grasping for power by vieing with each other which can descend the deepest into the degradation of fostering and upholding the Pro-Slavery interest, with all its accumulated evils both to the master and the slave. And over and over again is the dissolution of the Union threatened by those who have done so much to dissolve the bonds of harmony and fraternal regard among us, without which union is endangered.

Against all these accumulated ills—against these oft-repeated aggressions—against these evils of the present and the prospect of more in the future, what is our protection but to meet fairly and manfully the question now thrust upon us?

We repeat, it has not been now presented at our instigation. It has not been by our procurement that it is now agitating the hearts of our people to their deepest depths. It is forced upon us by circumstances beyond our control. But being upon us, we have no alternative but to submit, once and forever, to the triumphant domination of the slaveholding interest, or, by resisting, end it.

No man in whose heart beats one throb of the love of that Freedom which descends to us as our richest inheritance can for a moment hesitate which to choose. Our choice is made. We go for Freedom, and we invite all the people to associate with us.

But we are not and cannot be unmindful that they with whom we are thus called upon to contend are our brothers still, and members, with us, of the same great family of Freemen.

Cursed by an affliction which has been fastened upon them by the times which have passed—heirs to an inheritance of evil, which, unassisted, they cannot shake off, and whose bondage weighs even more heavily upon the master than upon the bondman, because it enslaves at once the mind and the heart, they are the objects of our compassion rather than of our resentment. For them as well as for ourselves, for their posterity as well as ours, will we struggle; and when the hour of victory shall come, as most assuredly it will, we will rejoice in it the more because of the emancipation it will bring to them—an emancipation which will at length enable them to stand side by side with us, an example of such freedom among men as the world has never known.

Such will be the result which must flow from the promise of the Constitutional Convention of 1787—such the result of the expectations of the people since that day, and such the result against which the aggressions of slavery are, and from that day have been waging its inveterate war. And while we aim not to interfere with the domestic relations of any State, we demand that the principles and the promises of the Revolution shall be carried out, so that slavery, with its inevitable and its enduring hostility to Freedom, may be confined within its legitimate limits, wherein, if it die not, like the scorpion, by the poison of its own sting, it will, at least, cease its invasion of Freedom's domain and its eternal warfare on that Union on which depends so much the welfare and happiness of our people, and the cause of Freedom throughout the world.

RESOLUTION.

The people of the State of New-York, represented in this Republican Convention, avowing their steadfast determination to uphold the Union of the States, and preserve the rights of the States, and the immunities and privileges guaranteed by the Federal Constitution to every individual, do hereby declare and

Resolve, That they affirm and accept the Platform of Principles adopted by the Republican National Convention in Philadelphia, in June, 1856, and will wage unceasing and inveterate war against the further extension of human slavery, and will give their cheerful and hearty support to the candidates presented by that Convention to the American people.

SOUTHERN REPUBLICANISM.

From The Baltimore Clipper.

AN ADDRESS TO THE REPUBLICANS OF MARYLAND.

THE Republicans of Maryland, in submitting an Electoral Ticket to the people, submit with it a declaration of their principles.

They declare true-hearted, entire devotion to the Constitution of the United States; and now that the subject of slavery, which was the greatest objection to the Union of the States under our Government, has been made the entering wedge to split it asunder, we declare our adhesion especially to the Compromises made in the Constitution, and which, in the acquisition of new territories, were in conformity to it, to settle the difficulties growing out of the question between the North and the South, which cemented the Union, and gave peace and prosperity to the country.

We declare our abhorrence of the repeal of the Missouri Compromise of 1820 and that of 1850 as a breach of faith and a violation of the compact between slaveholders and non-slaveholders, and the cause of civil war, now for the first time broached in our country; and proclaim it as our solemn conviction that there never can again be unity between the two classes of our citizens, or peace between the two great sections of our country, until the rights guaranteed by all the compromises in regard to slavery are fully restored.

We declare the charge, that the Republican party is in favour of the abolition of slavery, *to be utterly unfounded*. As a party, throughout the North, as well as at the South, they hold that this is a subject only to be disposed of by the government of the slave States (and we, as citizens of a slave State, pronounce *the opinion that the liberation of the blacks would be an unmixed and unmitigated evil, fatal to the African race, which would be crushed under the weight of the superior race, and, for a time*, degrading, and every way mischievous to the labouring classes among the latter, and calculated to unsettle the political as well as the economical elements of our Government). *We believe that slavery never can and never should be abolished without making just compensation for the capital sunk, whether it was capital invested in the purchase or rearing of the slaves.*

We believe that even with the consent of those interested, and just compensation made, the State Legislatures could not safely make a sudden emancipation, nor without provision, made through the agency of the General Government, for *the removal of the manumitted race to some region, as our continent between the tropics, suited to the African race, and where it is found the white race can never flourish.* Nature has put her interdict upon the amalgamation of the races; natural repugnance forbids it, and it is found that the hybrid race, whether of whites and blacks or between whites and Indians, always become abortive after several generations.

In every aspect in which slavery among us can be considered, it is pregnant with difficulty. Its continuance in the States in which it has taken root has resulted *in the monopoly of the soil, to a great extent, in the hands of the slaveholders, and the entire control of all departments of the State Government; and yet a majority of people in the slave States are not slaveowners.* This produces an anomally in the principle of our free institutions which threatens in time to bring into *subjugation to slaveowners the great body of the free white population;* and yet to get rid of slavery as an institution instantly *would prove ruinous to all classes, and must, therefore, be looked upon as impossible, and, if to be accomplished in time, can only be in a remote future, and, therefore, not to be thought of in connection with impending dangers.* To meet them, we must recur to the wisdom and patriotism of our fathers, which so happily averted all the mischief apprehended from this threatening element in our institutions, until the recent legislation of Congress overturned their work. They provided that the unsettled territories into which slavery has not entered shall be reserved for free labour.

This was the compromise which the slaveholders themselves proposed at the foundation of the Government—which was followed up by them in the Missouri Compromise and that of 1850, and this left to the 350,000 slaveholders within the boundaries one-third more territory than is composed in the free States, which contain at this time a population of no less than twenty millions. Add to this four millions of non-slaveholders in the South, and we have twenty-four millions of people who look to the unsettled territories for homes for themselves or for their posterity. Shall 350,000 slaveholders, who have within the slave States a third more land than there is in the non-slaveholding States, be permitted to carry an institution into the new territories, which will enable them to monopolize the soil in those territories, as they have already done in the slave States? The fact is clearly established, even by our brief experience, that even where a small proportion of the slaveholding, with slaves not numbering more than a tenth of the inhabitants, get footing in a territory, that the whole is sooner or later appropriated by them, and the power of the Government, with ownership of soil, fall into their hands.

The question now to be settled is: Shall the Territories reserved by the Compromises for free labour be encroached upon by slavery, and the free white man, of whatever class, who would fly from the institution, have no spot in the temperate regions of the national domain in which he can be secure?

The Homestead Bill, proposed by Mr. Grow, of Pennsylvania (one of the distinguished Republicans of that State), proposes to "grant to every actual settler on the public domain a homestead of 160 acres, on condition of occupancy and cultivation for the period of five years." This free gift to actual settlers would fill the region reserved by the compromises for free labour with owners of small freeholds from the North and South, in the course of a very few years.

The Government would receive an annual revenue, as much greater than that derived from the old States as the soil of the new lands is superior to that of the old States.

The promptitude with which the settlement would be made under this system would make returns to Government in the shape of revenue which would much more than indemnify in money for the loss of that which might have been derived from the dilatory sales of the lands, to say nothing of that return in the vast immigration of freemen it would invite, which, as a body of free, brave, toiling yeomanry, constitutes the best wealth of the nation.

For the rights once secured by the Compromises, for the 25,000,000 of our countrymen, for the South as well as the North, who have no share in the political and pecuniary advantages conferred on a class of 350,000 slaveowners, the Republican party of the United States organize their strength to contend. Their candidate, Colonel Fremont, has, in his letter accepting the nomination to the Presidency, declared in favour of the principles of the compacts which, excluding slavery, reserved the Territories for free labour, and in favour of the proposed legislation which would make every settler a *freeholder*. Mr. Buchanan, the candidate of the party misnamed the Democratic, has declared himself against the restoration of the principle of the Compromises, which established the Union, and which pacified the conventions of the country in 1820 and 1850.

He declares himself in favour of the measures which have destroyed the peace of the nation, and has solemnly pledged himself to the policy of the Administration, which, in failing to secure Kansas to slaveholders by the fraud of the Nebraska-Kansas Act, employs the military force of the nation, and calls out the militia of the States, to establish the usurpation imposed on the Territory by Atchison's invasion from Missouri, and to sustain the despotic laws which have defeated the organic laws of Congress, inviting emigrants from all sections, and which are designed to drive out the white labourer, and give the Territory to slavery.

The Republicans of Maryland declare opposition to the policy of the Administration, which, beginning with a violation of a most solemn treaty among the States, in reference to slavery, ends by making war upon those citizens who would avail themselves of the rights conferred by the organic act which repealed the Compromises. They declare opposition to the candidate set up by the party of the Administration to carry out its measures; but they also declare it to be their fixed purpose to rely on the constitutional remedy for mal-administration. They would use ballots, not bullets and bayonets.

They confidently rely on the suffrages of the people to place in power a Chief Magistrate and a Congressional representation that will give effect to public opinion, redress the wrongs that have been perpetrated by agents false to the will of their constituents, and restore peace and good feeling to a nation, which nothing but a sense of intolerable wrong could provoke to assume the hostile attitude which brings distress to the bosom of every lover of free institutions.

KANSAS.

INAUGURAL ADDRESS OF J. W GEARY, GOV. OF KANSAS TERRITORY,

Delivered at Leecmpton, September 11th, 1856.

FELLOW-CITIZENS: I appear among you a stranger to most of you, and for the first time have the honour to address you as Governor of the Territory of Kansas. The position was not sought by me, but was voluntarily tendered by the present Chief Magistrate of the nation. As an American citizen, deeply conscious of the blessings which ever flow from our beloved Union, I did not consider myself at liberty to shrink from any duties, however delicate and onerous, required of me by my country.

With a full knowledge of all the circumstances surrounding the executive office, I have deliberately accepted it, and, as God may give me strength and ability, I will endeavour faithfully to discharge its varied requirements. When I received my commission, I was solemnly sworn to support the Constitution of the United States and to discharge my duties as Governor of Kansas with fidelity. By reference to the act for the organization of this Territory, passed by Congress on the 30th day of March, 1854, I find my duties more particularly defined. Among other things, I am "to take care that the laws be faithfully executed."

The Constitution of the United States and the Organic Law of this Territory will be the lights by which I will be guided in my executive career.

A careful and dispassionate examination of our organic act will satisfy any reasonable person that its provisions are eminently just and beneficial. If this act has been distorted to unworthy purposes, it is not the fault of its provisions. The great leading feature of that act is the right therein conferred upon the actual and *bona fide* inhabitants of this Territory "in the exercise of self-government, to determine for themselves what shall be their own domestic institutions, subject only to the Constitution and the laws duly enacted by Congress under it." The people, accustomed to self-government in the States from whence they came, and having removed to this Territory with the *bona fide* intention of making it their future residence, were supposed to be capable of creating their own municipal Government, and to be the best judges of their own local necessities and institutions. This is what is termed "popular sovereignty." By this phrase we simply mean the right of the majority of the people of the several States and Territories, being qualified electors, to regulate their own domestic concerns and to make their own municipal laws. Thus understood, this doctrine underlies the whole system of republican government. It is the great right of self-government, for the establishment of which our ancestors, in the stormy days of the Revolution, pledged "their lives, their fortunes and their sacred honour."

A doctrine so eminently just should receive the willing homage of every American citizen. When legitimately expressed and duly ascertained, the will of the majority must be the imperative rule of civil action for every law-abiding citizen. This simple, just rule of action has brought order out of chaos, and, by a progress unparalleled in the history of the world, has made a few feeble infant colonies a giant confederated republic.

No man, conversant with the state of affairs now in Kansas, can close his eyes to the fact that much civil disturbance has for a long time past existed in this Territory. Various reasons have been assigned for this unfortunate condition of affairs, and numerons remedies have been proposed.

The House of Representatives of the United States have ignored the claims of both gentlemen claiming the legal right to represent the people of this Territory in that body. The Topeka Constitution, recognised by the House, has been repudiated by the Senate. Various measures, each in the opinion of its respective advocates suggestive of peace to Kansas, have been alternately proposed and rejected. Men *outside of the Territory*, in various sections of the Union, influenced by reasons best known to themselves, have endeavoured to stir up internal strife, and to array brother against brother.

In this conflict of opinion, and for the promotion of the most unworthy purposes, Kansas is left to suffer, her people to mourn, and her prosperity is endangered.

Is there no remedy for these evils? Cannot the wounds of Kansas be healed and peace be restored to all her borders?

Men of the North—men of the South—of the East and of the West, in *Kansas*—you, and you alone, have the remedy in your own hands. Will you not suspend fratricidal strife? Will you not cease to regard each other as enemies, and look upon one another as the children of a common mother, and come and reason together?

Let us banish all outside influence from our deliberations, and assemble around our council board, with the Constitution of our country and the organic law of the Territory as the great charts for our guidance and direction. The bona fide inhabitants of this Territory alone are charged with the solemn duty of enacting her laws, upholding her government, maintaining peace, and laying the foundation for a future Commonwealth.

On this point let there be a perfect unity of sentiment. It is the first great step toward the attainment of peace. It will inspire confidence among ourselves, and insure the respect of the whole country. Let us show ourselves worthy and capable of self-government.

Do not the inhabitants of this Territory better understand what domestic institutions are suited to their condition—what laws will be most conducive to their prosperity and happiness—than the citizens of distant or even neighbouring States? This great right of regulating our own affairs and attending to our own business, without any interference from others, has been guaranteed to us by the law which Congress has made for the organization of this Territory. This right of self-government—this privilege guaranteed to us by the organic law of our Territory, I will uphold with all my might, and with the entire power committed to me.

In relation to any changes of the laws of the Territory which I may deem desirable, I have no occasion now to speak; but these are subjects to which I shall direct public attention at the proper time.

The territory of the United States is the common property of the several States, or of the people thereof. This being so, no obstacle should be interposed to the free settlement of this common property, while in a territorial condition.

I cheerfully admit that the people of this Territory, under the Organic Act, have the absolute right of making their municipal laws, and from citizens who deem themselves aggrieved by recent legislation, I would invoke the utmost forbearance, and point out to them a sure and peaceable remedy. You have the right to ask the next Legislature to revise any and all laws; and in the meantime, as you value the peace of the Territory, and the maintenance of future laws, I would earnestly ask you to refrain from all violation of the present statutes.

I am sure there is patriotism sufficient in the people of Kansas to lend a willing obedience to the law. All the provisions of the Constitution of the United States must be sacredly observed, all the acts of Congress having reference to this Territory must be unhesitatingly obeyed, and the decision of our Courts respected. It will be my imperative duty to see that these suggestions are carried into effect. In my official action here, I will do justice at all hazards. Influenced by no other considerations than the welfare of the whole people of the Territory, I desire to know no party, no section, no North, no South, no East, no West—nothing but Kansas and my country.

Fully conscious of my great responsibilities in the present condition of things in Kansas, I must invoke your aid, and solicit your generous forbearance. Your executive officer can do little without the aid of the people. With a firm reliance upon Divine Providence, to the best of my ability I shall promote the interests of the citizens of the Territory, not merely collectively, but individually; and I shall expect from them in return that cordial aid and support without which the Government of no State or Territory can be administered.

Let us all begin anew. Let the past be hurled in oblivion. Let all strife and bitterness cease. Let us all honestly devote ourselves to the true interests of Kansas—develope her rich agricultural and mineral resources—build up manufacturing enterprises—make public roads and highways—prepare amply for the education of our children—devote ourselves to all the arts of peace—and make our Territory the sanctuary of those cherished principles which protect the inalienable rights of the individual, and elevate States in their sovereign capacities.

Then shall peaceful industry soon be restored—population and wealth will flow upon us—"the desert will bloom as a rose"—and the State of Kansas will soon be admitted into the Union the peer and pride of her older sisters.

JOHN W. GEARY.

National Anti-Slavery Standard.

WITHOUT CONCEALMENT—WITHOUT COMPROMISE.

NEW YORK, SATURDAY, SEPT. 27, 1856.

☞ THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE PENNSYLVANIA ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY will be held in Norristown on Thursday and Friday, the 16th and 17th days of October.

Among many other true-hearted and earnest speakers and workers in the cause, the Committee of Arrangements expect the presence and services of WILLIAM LLOYD GARRISON, PARKER PILLSBURY, SYDNEY H. GAY and OLIVER JOHNSON. But it is not on great names, or promises of eloquent oratory, that the Committee rely for the attractions of their anniversary meeting. The mighty revolution through which this reform is passing, the important crisis which it has reached, and the solemn responsibilities which are resting upon those who awakened, and have led that revolution, impart unusual interest to the occasion, and must insure the presence of all the faithful labourers of our organization, who are not detained from our gathering by other duties. We earnestly and heartily invite, also, the presence of all others, whether friendly or hostile to our enterprise. The fundamental principles of that enterprise, the unceasing utterance of which has been the business of the American Anti-Slavery Society, through all the years of toil and conflict, from its outset to the present hour, will be fully and freely discussed, and plans for future action formed and adopted. The Committee trust that their coadjutors, the Abolitionists of Pennsylvania, will assemble, on this occasion, each feeling his or her obligation to meet the present demands of the cause, and fully resolved to maintain faithful allegiance to its principles.

JAMES MOTT, Pres't.
CLINTON GILLINGHAM, Rec. Sec'y.

MR. SPEAKER BANKS, in a speech at Waltham, on the occasion of his Reception there on his return home from Washington the other day, a portion of which we quoted a week or two since, declares as one having authority, that "in no event of human history will the Union of these States be dissolved." As Mr. Banks did not display his commission as a Prophet on that occasion, or prove, if he claimed, the enjoyment of any supernatural intimations as to what Fate or Providence has in store for this nation, we hope we shall not be regarded as irreverent if we presume to differ from him *toto cælo* in this opinion. Indeed, using only the lesser lights which history, a common observation of the workings of human nature and the small portion of common sense with which we are endowed afford, we must make bold to affirm that so far from its being impossible for this Union to be dissolved, it is morally and politically impossible for this Union to hold together—except in the single contingency of the Abolition of Slavery by the Slaveholders. Possibly, Mr. Banks means that this alternative will be adopted by them, in order to avoid the horrors of self-dependence. But he does not say so, and we are left to suppose that he means that this Union is indissoluble with all its imperfections on its head and with all its vices upon its soul.

What is there in this aggregation of States that is to endow it with immortality any more than belonged to other unions of provinces and nations which have long since melted apart? What seemed more inseparable than the parts of the Roman Empire, all bound together by the bands of a common civilization, or rather of a civilization bestowed by the Supreme Whole upon its components? Why did the Low Countries fall off from the heritage of Philip II., and why, in our own times, has Belgium broken away from Holland? Why did not this American Continent remain, one and inseparable, an integral part of the British Empire? Let us place ourselves only a century back, in the heat and fever of the Old French War, and what seemed more unlikely than that the child should strike away the hand of the mother to which it was clinging for protection and set up the staff of its own independence? Hundreds of persons whose career on earth had begun then are still alive, and yet that liberation has been accomplished for more than eighty years. Is there anything in the nature of our polity which takes it out of the category of mortality and raises it to the eternity of the gods? It was made by men; what hinders that it may be unmade by men, as well? The vein of magniloquence in which Mr. Banks indulges himself, and which is but too common a mode of rhetoric among politicians, is simply absurd. The Union will endure as long as it answers the purposes of those that make it up and no longer.

Why have former congeries of states or provinces gone asunder? Whence have come the ruins of Empires of which almost all history is but the record? From vices inherent in the Constitution which held them together, was it not? Men undertook in the old days of Assyria and Egypt, and Greece, and Rome, to build the foundation of their dominion on injustice and wrong. For a time they flourished, but in due time the divine laws vindicated their penalty, and they fell to pieces and came to nought. And so measurably has it been with the powers of modern Europe. Thus Spain forfeited her provinces and England hers, thus came the French Revolution to purge the threshing-floors of Europe, and hence will come the fullness of those changes of which we see only the foreshadowings as yet. Our fathers undertook to do this precise thing; only they did it with their eyes open and seeing plainly the evil leaven with which they kneaded the bread of their political life and that of their sons. They did not see the end from the beginning, and they hoped that they should escape the inexorable price which all preceding nations had had to pay for seeking to circumvent the Almighty. They consented to incorporate with their institutions the blackest of crimes, to protect it by their physical and moral power and to make it an element of political superiority on the part of the criminals. It has brought forth its natural fruit. It has wrought its necessary effects. What right have we to expect that God will reverse the laws which he enacted before the world was that we may enjoy the sweets of the villany we have consented unto and yet escape its bitters? The present supremacy of Slavery in the Nation, all the outrages and wrongs in Kansas, the blackness of darkness that overhangs our future, all is owing to the wicked agreement of our fathers with the Slave Power. And it must remain as bad and grow from worse to worse as long as we seek to own our own property on these bloody conditions.

Mr. Banks thinks that he may live to see a military despotism prevailing over the whole country; but that the country must and will remain whole. He holds that the dominant power will never suffer the weaker to go in peace, but will hold on to it with the iron hand of armed strength. We live under a military despotism at this moment. What is now going on in Kansas is only a natural type and expression of the nature of the power that rules over us. It is terrorism by which it seeks to govern us, the terrorism of assassination at Washington and of extermination in Kansas. And this principle it is ready to apply everywhere that its domination is resisted. If it has not been able to do this everywhere, or if it should yet be effectually resisted in its encroachments, it is in spite of the Constitution and the Union our fathers left us and not because of them. That Union must be dissolved by the elimination of Slavery on the one hand or of Freedom on the other. It cannot last as it is. Read the Slaveholding newspapers, read the proceedings at the Brooks Receptions at the South, and read, not what we say, or *The Liberator*, but the language held by what are still loyal and Constitutional Northern presses—the organs of Mr. Banks's own party—and see what degree of unity exists between the two portions of the country. How can two walk together except they be agreed? And the North plainly cannot walk much further with the South unless it be as Sindbad did with the Old Man of the Sea—carrying her on her shoulders and obeying her in all things. We think, as Mr. Banks once said, that before this could be endured, we had better "let the Union slide." It must slide indeed, sooner or later, when men are busy on each side knocking away all the props that hold it up.

MORE FILLIBUSTERING PROPOSED.—It will be recollected that a terrible fight, in which many persons were killed, occurred at Aspinwall, New Grenada, between the natives and a party of passengers on the railroad, some months since, and that a Mr. Amos B. Corwine was sent out there by the United States Government to inquire into the affair. This person has returned, and made his report to the Secretary of State, in which he gives, at great length, all the testimony collected on the spot as to the origin and progress of the affray. It is probably no more than was expected by everybody that this report should be a plea to sustain a foregone conclusion, and that the Commissioner should appear rather as the unscrupulous counsel for one side, than the righteous judge to judge between both. Such, at any rate, seems to be the fact. The statements of the American residents are allowed to pass unquestioned, or taken for granted as positively true, while the evidence of the natives is constantly impeached, and the attempt made to invalidate it altogether. An inquiry conducted in such a spirit could come only to one conclusion, and the Commissioner, therefore, reports that the affray was begun by the coloured natives, that it was premeditated for purposes of plunder, instigated by dislike of United States citizens, that the authorities made no effort to suppress the riot, and "that the Government of New Grenada is unable to maintain law and enforce order on the Isthmus, and afford adequate protection to the transit." This last conclusion is one of no little importance. A riot, and even a premeditated riot, might be forgiven, with promises of future good behaviour. But if the Government is incapable of preserving peace and enforcing law, what then shall be done? It is the old fable of the wolf and the lamb. If the lamb did not muddy the stream because he was below the wolf; if he did not do it last Spring, because he was not born; then it *must* have been its father, for the necessity of his being eaten is perfectly manifest. Whatever was the cause of this riot, all riots must be prevented in future. If the Government cannot prevent them, the United States must. It follows, as certainly as that the lamb's father muddied the water, that the Government of New Grenada has no such power over her subjects, and, therefore, the United States *must* take the Isthmus. Hear Mr. Corwine:

In view, therefore, of this state of things, and of the repeated outrages committed upon our countrymen and their property, as well as the immense amount of American capital invested in the Panama Railroad, the steamships employed in connection therewith, the great amount of travel and treasure constantly going by this route to and from our Atlantic and Pacific possessions, I feel it a duty incumbent on me *to recommend the immediate occupancy of the Isthmus, from Ocean to Ocean, by the United States, as the best practicable mode to insure safety and tranquillity to the transit;* unless New Grenada, after the proper representations shall have been made, and the necessary demand made upon her, in pursuance of treaty stipulations, can satisfy us as to her ability and inclination to afford the proper protection and make speedy and ample atonement for the wrongs inflicted upon our countrymen by the people and officials of the State of Panama.

The "unless she can satisfy us" Mr. Corwine has already disposed of. That New Grenada cannot maintain law and enforce order he considers as conclusively settled by this very riot. Fillibusterism is the only remedy. It is not likely, however, that it will be applied till after the Presidential election. It is only a little job laid out for Mr. Buchanan's Administration, in case he should ever have one. The only obstacle to its success will be England. The Central American question, with her, means, among other things, perhaps more than all other things, free passage for all nations across the Isthmus, but no other sovereignty there than exists already. She will not be left out of the question at the day of settlement whenever it comes.

GREAT IS TRUTH, says the Latin proverbs, and it shall prevail at last. They are beginning to find us out in Europe. It will yet be plain to the "crumbling despotisms of the Old World," as we love to call them on 4th of July, and other festive occasions, that there is a rampant despotism in the New quite as determined, and quite as execrable, and, so far as one portion of our population is concerned, infinitely more galling than any that Europe has known for centuries. Mr. C. L. Brace, a travelling correspondent of *The Independent*, writing from Stockholm, Sweden, says:

I met lately a gentleman, one of the most eminent in Natural Science in Northern Europe—Professor Rezius, of Stockholm. He asked about America, and without waiting almost for a reply, he said with great warmth: "Sir, *the triumph of Fremont in this election of yours will be the triumph of civilization.* We know him well here—a great man, a great man, sir; a true friend of freedom, rational freedom." He then turned to a friend and explained that he was the same who had received the medal of the Geographical Society, and had made those discoveries in California. "He saved California from slavery also, I hear."

"We never watched an election as we do this," he added. "It seems a crisis in your history, and it will crush the hopes of the liberal party here to see your Free Party defeated."—"I do not say *Democratic* party," he said, turning to a friend—"Strange! Democrat means Aristocrat in America—upholder of slavery! Yes, you have the same struggles there, under other names, that we do here. But the foreigners, how are they going?"

I told him I feared very many would go against Freedom.

Several present expressed great regret, and said: "You cannot reckon on the Germans acting well in mass. They never act nobly in great bodies!"

Everywhere among the upper classes of these countries this election is so regarded. I know repeated instances. It is so often noticed also with commendation, that Fremont is a *savant* and not a politician.

I have spoken already of the change of popular feeling towards America in the North of Europe, since my first visit in 1850. An American gentleman, who has been here for the last six or seven years, says "America has fallen 50 per cent."

Professor Rezius and others, if they keep their eyes open, will, by and bye, see a new sight, and learn another lesson. The last chapter in the History of American Despotism is not to be headed FREMONT. Good as the Republican movement is, it is not, and does not pretend to be, a finality. If it should ever succeed in being more than a *protest* against the Slave Power, it can, at best, be only a successful resistance to one of its acts of tyranny. This, too, will be learned in due season.

RELATIONS OF THE FREE STATES WITH MISSOURI.

IF the votes given by the free States or by Massachusetts alone for the admission of Missouri had been reversed, she would not have been received into the Union. It is true that her reception with the blight and stain of slavery was contrary to the cherished sentiments of those States, and the rectitude of those sentiments and the wisdom of the opposition have been too well verified.

Out of the repugnance which Massachusetts manifested, thirty-five years ago, to the formation of the Missouri Compact has been concocted a principal argument for its recent repudiation. That State, say her "weak-hearted enemies," dismissed with disgrace the agents who, on her part, agreed to it, and she has since sought to abrogate it.

If a sovereign State finds her settled and solemn convictions derided, and her interests and honour betrayed, by her agents, in a transaction of the highest importance, and she discards them, yet abides by the agreement they made and faithfully performs her part of it, does this furnish a reason why the other party, after receiving the full value of that performance, should fly off as soon as benefit was beginning to accrue to her and to the cause of freedom, by whose inspirations she was actuated?

Suppose the accusation true, that Massachusetts and other free States sought to annul the contract, would this affect the obligations of the other party? Are not American statesmen, and especially those of the slave section, now demanding the abrogation or modification of the Central American Treaty with Great Britain? Is that compact any the less in force and to remain so until altered or annulled by mutual consent of the contracting parties?

In point of fact, Massachusetts never sought the abrogation or modification of the Missouri Compact. Reluctantly and indignantly she acquiesced in it, but stood loyally by it. Maligners of the noble old Commonwealth, whose enmity does her honour, have ferretted out the fact that some of her citizens remonstrated against the admission of Arkansas as a slave State; and that Mr. Adams voted against it; but they omit to tell their constituents that he voted against it not as a slave State (for he fully admitted its title to be received), but as a sovereign State, emasculating itself, by an unnatural, anti-republican and inhuman provision of its Constitution, of the power to remove the chains of a slave!

In respect to the remonstrances from Massachusetts on that occasion, our answer is ready and brief. A few of the citizens of that State never did acquiesce in the Missouri Compromise. We were among them. We prepared a memorial to Congress against Arkansas as a slave State, and procured a hundred and fifty signers, and we feel pleasure in the retrospection. The Missouri Compromise was the offspring of intrigue and treachery. It was a fraud upon the free States as well in its formation as its subversion. But did this resistance by argument and entreaty, addressed to both parties, impair its obligation? If a minority of a mercantile firm should propose to repudiate a contract, and a majority determine to stand by it, and the whole company continue to perform and to pay, how could this relieve the other party from the obligation to fulfil their part. By any upright tribunal the attempt to justify a breach on such a frivolous and audacious pretext would be deemed an aggravation of the injury, and good ground of enhancing damages.

Such wretched subterfuges are unconscious confessions of the infamous and deadly wrong which has been done us, because they imply that there was a *compact* between us and the wrong-doers, which even they, unscrupulous as they habitually are, deemed too sacred and binding to be sundered without a previous delinquency on our part. Therefore, they got up the fiction of infringements or attempts to infringe it—an expedient more immoral and dishonourable than the fraud it was intended to hide. It added to bad faith hypocrisy, falsehood and calumny.

We of the North have been guilty of one deviation from the Missouri Compact, and it is the only one of which Missourians and their coadjutors have not accused us. Their State was originally bounded on the west by a due north and south line, which cut the Missouri at its confluence with the Kansas, and enclosed all the Little Platte River region. By the Missouri Compact that tract was consecrated forever to freedom in common with all the rest of the Territory north and west of Missouri. Some fifteen years ago, the Missourians conceived a desire to grasp that tract, though they had already more territory than any other State, and nearly ten times as much as Massachusetts. Their politicians, eager to gratify them and to secure their favour, set to work to obtain the coveted district. Mr. Benton has repeatedly told the story. He says that he personally solicited the consent of Northern members of Congress to this arrangement, but names Webster only as one to whom he addressed himself. He, without hesitation, acceded to the request. In the House, Mr. Briggs, then a Representative and since Governor of Massachusetts, objected to it, and, for the time, arrested it. Gen. Ashley, a Representative of Missouri, privately entreated the Massachusetts member to withdraw his opposition, representing that it was a gore of land, wild and of little value except to Missouri, and important to her only as establishing her boundary on the river. It was nothing to the Eastern States, but would be regarded as a boon by Missouri. Mr. Briggs, with a misplaced magnanimity, and with that fatal facility which has cooperated with brutal threats and rank corruption to bring things to the present pass, yielded his consent and the bill was passed.

It was in reality a bill to abrogate the Missouri compact in respect to more than three thousand square miles of the choicest territory, both for soil and situation, to which the Compromise applied. It now forms seven Counties, according to Mr. Benton, lying mostly along the Eastern bank of the Missouri and confronting Kansas. They are among the most fertile and valuable of the State.

It might be supposed that Missouri, and particularly that portion of it, would have felt some touch of gratitude to the free States, and especially to Massachusetts, for such a favour, and that it would have been testified at the first opportunity by acts of kindness and courtesy to her sons and daughters. But three or four of those very Counties are the principal dens of the banditti who have robbed, lynched, scalped and murdered the children of their benefactors, sacked and burned their industrious and peaceful towns and dwellings, destroyed or stolen their cattle and provisions, captured ladies' ear-rings and violated their persons. Massachusetts is the special object of their spite and malice. So the viper stung the bosom which warmed it into life.

Mr. Sumner, smitten by assassin hands, and placed, probably by preconcert, in the equally dangerous hands of a doctor, refused to discharge him, though advised thereto by his attendants and friends. Being, by a necessary law of noble minds, unconscious of malice and disloyalty himself, he was too incredulous of their existence in others; and had it not been for the timely arrival of a sagacious and energetic brother, he would now most likely be numbered with the dead.

Very similar to this has been the experience of our emigrating brethren and sisters with the Missourians. In making large expenditures for outfits, they frankly bestowed their money upon St. Louis, Westport, Weston, Kansas City, &c., all which have sent forth or sustained without a note of remonstrance those cruel miscreants, who have repaid the generous confidence of their peaceful and friendly fellow-citizens with sacrilege, murder, pillage and conflagration.

We feel no regret at this frank and unsuspicious procedure of our Free State men. It springs from an ingenuousness of disposition and culture which are precious beyond all price to individual and social happiness and the foundation of a State. Of this let it be hoped that no contact with the fiends of the Border or of any other place will ever deprive them. It is better for the soul to suffer the extremest pain than to take the gangrene of perpetual suspicion.

Now we are forewarned and shall be forearmed, not always to be *disarmed* by highwaymen and pirates. John Quincy Adams after attempting vainly for ten days to present a petition, signed by 40,000 legal voters of Massachusetts, and being compelled at last to commit it to *the discretion of the Speaker*, said very quietly, "It won't always be so, Mr. Speaker." D. L. C.

"LIBERTY."—Many of our friends, no doubt, will remember a publication with this title, issued a good many years ago, in paper covers, and marked by the "Liberty Bell," if we remember right, on its title-page. A large number of this book has been given away in times past by the American Society till not a copy is to be found in the office. We are now greatly in need of one or two of them. If any fri

ANOTHER SUNDAY STAMPEDE.—The Rev. S. A. Corey, pastor of the Baptist Church in Fifth Avenue, in this city, has recently received a similar compliment to that which was paid, a short time since, to the Rev. Mr. Tyng of Philadelphia, and which was paid a good while ago to another person, when a whole herd of creatures went over a high precipice into the sea. Mr. Corey, in his discourse on a recent Sunday evening, used the following language, which is given *verbatim* in *The Independent*.

"But, while association has its advantages, it has its evils too. In association, man loses his individuality. His opinions, his actions, must square with the opinions, the actions of the party. He cannot think for himself—he cannot act for himself; the platform must think for him, must act for him! Out upon this! God made man to *think for himself*, and not to be simply a splinter in a platform of opinion. Is *he* a man who dares not think upon the bloody drama now enacting in our border territory, who dare not demur to the slaughter upon its virgin soil of the sons of New-England, who with their families have gone there to make themselves homes? Is *he* a man who knowing these things and thinking upon them, dare not *speak*? And is it not high time that *ministers* should speak out, when the sanctity of vows is to be trifled with in the manner it has been, and we are plunged into worse than civil war? *I claim the right as a citizen and as a minister of the gospel to express my mind, and to hope that the tide of opinion that is now flowing towards freedom of speech and freedom of conscience may prove* RESISTLESS, and that the time may yet come when freemen, white and black, may live on either side of Mason's and Dixon's line!"

Such language has clearly nothing to do with any of the sins committed in Judea eighteen hundred years ago, and therefore four members of Mr. Corey's congregation, shocked at such ill-timed and misplaced preaching, immediately rose and left the church.

We are reminded by this circumstance of a similar one which occurred some years ago in Massachusetts. A friend of ours, a man of rare attainments, a noble spirit, and an uncompromising wit, was in the habit, even in those early days, of preaching upon the duties of American Christians to their oppressed brethren. There was a certain church where he occasionally ministered, and where there were several persons who, indisposed to listen to the rebukes he had so often administered to them, left their pews the moment he entered the pulpit. On one occasion, seeing these persons go out as he went in, he lifted up his voice, in the first prayer, and besought the Lord that he would have mercy upon those who were afflicted with sudden sickness! We have never heard whether the afflicted persons ever sufficiently recovered to be out again of a Sunday.

KANSAS.

IN another column will be found the Inaugural Address of the New Governor of Kansas which we give as a point in her history, which should be found in our columns. It will be observed that he enforces the necessity of obedience to the laws of the Territorial Legislature, to do which is all that the pro-slavery party ever have required or ever need require. The most sanguine have but little hope for Kansas in this new Administration. The latest news is as follows:

LAWRENCE, K. T., Monday, Sept. 15, }
Via. ST. LOUIS, Saturday, Sept. 20. }

Twenty-eight hundred men, mostly Missourians, reached Franklin yesterday, destined to attack Lawrence. Owing to our reliance upon Gov. Geary somewhat for protection, our force is mostly in the country. About five hundred remain, preparing to fight in our fortifications.

Our advance guards came into collision last night, and three of the enemy's men are reported killed—none of ours injured.

Just then orders came from the Governor, forbidding the approach of the Pro-Slavery forces. They then fell back and camped at Franklin.

Four hundred troops arrived here last night for protection.

This morning, the Governor in person disbanded the Ruffians under Gen. Reed, member elect to the next Missouri Legislature. These are no longer Territorial militia. Many of them swear they will have blood in spite of the Governor.

Our citizens have enrolled as his militia. A collision is feared.

Col. Harvey's regiment fought at Hartford, yesterday and won, killing three, wounding many. Five of Harvey's men were wounded. His whole force were taken prisoners by dragoons while returning. RANDOLPH.

FIGHTING AT GRASSHOPPER FALLS AND HICKORY POINT—LEAVENWORTH DESERTED, ETC.

ST. LOUIS, Saturday, Sept. 20, 1856.

The steamer Polar Star, from Kansas the 15th inst., reports that Capt. Robinson, with a company of fifty-two Pro-Slavery men, attacked a Free State force at Grasshopper Falls, on the 13th, killing two of their men and capturing their provisions, ammunition and horses. The next day Col. Harvey, with two hundred Free Soilers, attacked Robinson's force, who had fortified themselves in a log house at Hickory Point. After fighting two hours and losing twelve men and having several wounded, Col. Harvey proposed an armistice of thirty days, which was accepted. Capt. Robinson lost three men killed and had many wounded.

Leavenworth was deserted.

Gov. Geary was at Lecompton.

MR. UNDERWOOD'S WIFE.—Mr. John C. Underwood, who is still an exile from Virginia because he went to a public meeting in Philadelphia, and repeated there some things which Thomas Jefferson once said of Virginia slavery, sends the following letter to *The Evening Post* of this city. We should remember, that we may fully appreciate the courage of the act here related, that a Fremont flag in Virginia is looked upon as the very black, piratical flag of abolitionism itself. No doubt there are a good many people in that neighbourhood whose rest is broken, and dreams perturbed, because Mrs. Underwood will keep that bit of bunting flying above her roof.

Mr. Underwood says:

A letter from my wife, who had been spending a Sabbath with her aunt a few miles from home, thus describes the first Republican flag which has been raised in the Old Dominion:

"I had a real laugh on Monday, when I came in sight of our house, to see fluttering in the breeze a Fremont flag on a high liberty pole, which Edward, assisted by the men on the place, had raised in my absence. They had painted a piece of linen red and white, and put the letters on in a homely way, but still it was a Fremont flag. Some of the neighbours have threatened to cut it down, but the boys gave out that they slept with a loaded gun bearing upon the pole, and would certainly put a ball through the man that touched an ax to it; and so it has stood. I have pomised to make them a nice flag, and will send to-morrow for the materials—red, white and blue. Oh, how I wish I could get Fremont and Dayton put on it nicely, in large letters! If I choose to put up on our own land a Fremont flag, have I not the right? If not, do tell me, and I will not do it; but if I can, I am resolved to have the flag up, let the consequences be what they may. Some gentlemen have called and advised to have it taken down, said it was injuring us very much; but I said, No; it was up and it should stay up till I got a letter from you."

This I consider pretty good pluck in a woman, and boy only in his fourteenth year; and I reckon I shall not advise the striking of that flag.

CONVENTION OF COLOURED MEN.—The coloured citizens of this State held a Convention at Williamsburg, in the early part of this week. We have seen nothing but a very meagre report of the proceedings, but understand that measures were set on foot to establish suffrage associations in the different parts of the State, and that the following resolutions were adopted:

Resolved, That, inasmuch as the Republican party of this country presents a platform more consistent with the principles of liberty and justice than that of any other party, we therefore pledge ourselves to use our best endeavours to secure the success of the candidates nominated by that party, namely, Fremont and Dayton for President and Vice-President, and King and Selden for Governor and Lieutenant-Governor.

Resolved, That we further recommend that the various Suffrage Associations in different parts of the State appoint committees to interrogate candidates for office in their respective localities.

There may have been some farther action of the Convention to modify or explain the purpose of these resolutions, for, as they stand, they rather recommend a divided duty. The first commits those voting for it unreservedly to the Republican movement, and if the reason given is sufficient for that, then why should there have been a suggestion of farther question? It is not impossible that the questioning of candidates may reveal that there are Republicans who are not in favour of giving the right of suffrage to coloured men; and what, in that case, shall the coloured man, who already possesses the right of suffrage, do with his vote? "Ask me no questions and I will tell you no lies," is a good general maxim to be governed by in politics.

HENRY C. WRIGHT, who is now lecturing for Fremont in Michigan, writes to Wm. Lloyd Garrison as follows:

"My text is—DOWN WITH THE AMERICAN UNION! UP WITH A NORTHERN REPUBLIC! THE THOUGHTS OF THOUSANDS ARE TURNED TO THIS GLORIOUS CONSUMMATION BY RECENT EVENTS IN WASHINGTON AND KANSAS."—*Augusta Age.*

The *Age* man fibs it egregiously, and he knows it. Henry C. Wright is a non-voting, disunion abolitionist, and he is opposed to Fremont.

Fremont will be elected, and all such disunionists as H. C. Wright and B. A. G. Fuller will be taken care of!—*Portland Journal and Inquirer.*

We do not know whether H. C. Wright is opposed to the election of Fremont or not, but we know that he does not, and does not pretend to, speak for anybody but himself. But will this Republican paper (the *Portland Journal*) have the goodness to tell us how disunionists are to "be taken care of" after Fremont's election? And does it think that its party gains anything by this sort of appeal to a vulgar and pro-slavery prejudice?

REPUBLICAN STATE TICKET.

WE had only time, before going to press, last week, to give the names of the Republican nominees for Governor and Lieutenant-Governor, in this State. The full ticket, which was afterwards completed, is as follows:

For Governor—JOHN A. KING.
For Lieutenant-Governor—HENRY B. SELDEN.
For Canal Commissioner—CHAS. H. SHERRILL, of Oneida.
For State Prison Inspector—WESLEY BAILEY, of Oneida.
For Clerk of Appeals—RUSSELL F. HICKS, of Livingston.

ELECTORS FOR PRESIDENT AND VICE-PRESIDENT.

At Large—JAMES F. WADSWORTH, of Livingston; MOSES H. GRINNELL, of New York.

Dist.	*Dist.*
XVI—MIDSHORNE TOMPKINS,	XVII—SMITH STILLWELL.
II—AMOS P. STANTON.	XVIII—DANIEL CADY.
III—JAMES KENNEDY.	XIX—ROBERT S. HUGHSTON.
IV—HERMANN RASTER.	XX—JAMES S. LYNCH.
V—DANIEL L. PETTIT.	XXI—WILLIAM S. SAYRE.
VI—JOHN BELCHER.	XXII—DANIEL H. MARSH.
VII—GEORGE LAW.	XXIII—ASHLEY DAVENPORT.
VIII—THOMAS CARNLEY.	XXIV—LEROY MORGAN.
IX—JARED V. PECK.	XXV—ELEAZER BURNHAM.
X—JOHN P. JONES.	XXVI—M. H. LAWRENCE.
XI—ERASTUS COOKE.	XXVII—JOSIAH B. WILLIAMS.
XII—ROBERT A. BARNARD.	XXVIII—ISAAC F. ENDRESS.
XIII—JOHN G. MCMURRAY.	XXIX—FREEMAN CLARK.
XIV—H. H. VAN DYCK.	XXX—WM. S. BALLOU.
XV—JOHN C. HURLBUT.	XXXI—WM. KING.
XVI—JACOB D. HUGLAND.	XXXII—RUFUS WHEELER.
	XXXIII—DELOS E. SILL.

From our Boston Correspondent.

NO. CXCVII.

THE ARGUMENT.—The Correspondent is embarrassed by riches—He giveth the philosophy of the Burlingame Reception—He standeth by the duello—He defendeth it and quoteth Orthodox authority—He describeth the Reception—He compareth this with the Reception of Mr. Webster—He condoleth with Our First Men—He telleth of the Worcester Convention—Of the plots and counterplots—Of how Governor Gardner did the Republicans—The Correspondent commendeth him and prophesieth smooth things concerning him—He describeth the Franklin Celebration—The Streets, the Escort, the Trades and the Free Masons—He discommendeth the Statue—And why—He maketh promises for the future and concludeth, &c., &c., &c.

BOSTON, Sept. 22, 1856.

I CAN'T complain this week of having nothing to say. I am rather perplexed by the embarrassment of riches, as the French say; for items, like sorrows, come not single spies, but in battalions. First of all, there was the Burlingame Reception, which I see you gird at and think one of the most notional of our notions. Perhaps it was; but I don't think the duel had anything to do with it, excepting so far as it did not hinder it. It was a feeling that Mr. Burlingame had shown pluck and had stood up to Brooks on the whole in a *gamy* sort of way which overbore the deficiencies of some of the details of his conduct and made people desirous of standing by him. I don't believe, as I told you at the time, that the fact of his having accepted the challenge will really affect his vote next November. It may be made the pretext of voting for somebody else; but very few out and out politicians will be moved by it. And why should any one who holds to the lawfulness of war between nations make any bones about war between individuals? If a man injures me there is an intelligible reason why I should try to kill him; but none at all why I should try to kill a Mexican or an Englishman who had never injured me, merely because a pack of drunken scoundrels at Washington want to steal some land for slavery (for we can't have a war about anything else) and have agreed to employ me to do it. I think I should be no whit more wicked, and out of sight more sensible, in the first case than in the last. For my part, as far as this matter is concerned, I would as soon vote for Mr. Burlingame as for General Scott. In this case, a good Orthodox church member avowed to me his entire approbation of Mr. Burlingame's conduct and protested that he thought no man should be sent to Congress who would not "wink and hold out his iron." And I rather think he stands for a class.

Be this as it may, it was a splendid demonstration. Webster never had anything that surpassed it in numbers or enthusiasm. The Tremont Temple was packed like a herring-box, and not merely the Temple, but the lobbies and stairways leading to it were swarming with people. The Meionaon or Lesser Temple, on the ground floor, was also as full as it could hold with the overflowings from above, and the street was one pavement of faces as far as you could see in both directions. As they were lighted up by the blue lights the effect was singularly fine. Afterwards there was a procession which brought up in Bowdoin Square, in front of the Revere House. The last time I was there on a public occasion was when Mr. Benjamin R. Curtis (now Judge Curtis) welcomed Mr. Webster home after his glorious campaign of the Compromises, and when, flushed with his victory over his own Prejudices, he exhorted us also to conquer ours. But that gathering was contemptible in point of numbers, and dull in point of enthusiasm compared with this. It was very funny to see Mr. Wilson and Mr. Burlingame haranguing the people from the very balcony whence Mr. Webster had often spoken in answer to the summons of his admirers. It witnessed to an amazing change in the run of the tide within five or six years, and the festive uproar must have grated harshly on the ears of some of Our First Men who had for so long a time regarded themselves as having a vested right to the monopoly of such demonstrations here. I am afraid the slumbers of some most respectable persons were disturbed that night. *Mine* were not, at all.

The next event was the Republican Convention at Worcester—no, I lie, as John Randolph used to say, it was not a Republican but a People's Convention—to nominate Electors and State officers. But, though a People's Convention, it was as nigh to a Republican one as the Mermaid Lord Stowell went to see (who boasted he had seen everything that could be seen for a shilling in London) was to "the ould say-sarpent" his lordship had often seen before. All the People I knew by sight were Republicans. There was a Convention of Fremont Know-Nothings in session at the same time, and the object in view was to nominate a joint ticket of Electors and then to do the best they could for State officers. The Electoral Ticket was arranged without any open objection, though the names of two or three of the Know-Nothings seemed almost to turn the gorge of the Republicans. Then the hitch of the day came. Governor Gardner, you must know, was already in nomination, and so was the whole Know-Nothing ticket of this stripe. The more anti-slavery portion of the Republicans abhorred the idea of having to take Gardner as their candidate, and there were sundry plots for heading him. One was to nominate Mr. Sumner and carry it by acclamation. This, with no intention of not re-electing him Senator all the same next Winter, leaving the State in the hands of the Lieutenant-Governor. But, in the first place, it leaked out, and so the surprise which was material to the success of this plan was impossible; and, secondly, the horrible idea supervened that, if they should succeed in making him Governor over Gardner's head, it was by no means impossible that that cunning and unscrupulous man should so play his hand as to sweep the board of the Senatorship and pocket it himself. This was enough to make the stoutest hold his breath. Then there was a scheme of setting up Mr. Burlingame on the strength of his present popularity. But that fell through also—it being understood that he declined any such promotion.

The arrangement of State matters was left to a Committee of Conference, which reported late in the afternoon that the Know-Nothing Convention disclaimed any power whatever except to nominate Electors. They were willing, however, to agree to use their influence to procure an amalgamation with the Republicans in the Counties and States, and, by way of return, the Committee recommended that the Republicans adopt the Know-Nothing State Nominations! That is, the Republicans were to give the Know-Nothings everything in the faith that they would toss them a charitable crust or two back again. When this Report was offered, the scene was of the very liveliest description. Mr. Wilson and Mr. Banks recommended the adoption of the Report, on the ground of the paramount importance of giving a thumping vote for Fremont and putting the reelection of Sumner beyond a peradventure. The whole Congressional force was on this side, partly because of the greater sense they had of the danger of irritating the Know-Nothings of other States and partly from a well-grounded apprehension of the mischief Gardner could work in their own districts, if he were driven to stand at bay. The uproar was prodigious for a long time. It was evident, however, that the Gardner wing of the Convention had the better of it. It was with the greatest difficulty that one or two persons were allowed to speak in the negative, and it seemed as if the Report must be adopted by a strong majority. Had this been done, there would probably have been a bolt and a separate nomination made. But some astute individual moved that no State nominations be made at all—leaving everyone free to vote for whom he pleased. This was caught at by the majority and passed by a great vote, though not without resistance. This was precisely what Governor Gardner wanted. It will secure him his election by a large majority without identifying him with the Black Republicans, in case Buchanan should win. On the other hand, should "the Mustang Colt" get to the goal first, he will stand in the position of having carried Massachusetts in his favour. And he will unquestionably receive, when the cake is distributed, a slice from the very plummiest side of the loaf as his share. He will have whatever he may choose to ask for—a place in the Cabinet or a capital Foreign Mission, or whatever else suits him better. Then should Fremont fail, he will hold a position in the State which may enable him to tumble Mr. Wilson out of the saddle and take his seat himself, year after next. So you may judge whether he has played his hand well or not, and whether the men he has outwitted, or outgeneralled, like the predicament in which they find themselves.

The next day after this was the Inauguration of the Franklin Statue. This was made a great occasion of. The city was crowded with people, as I found out the night before to my cost, as I could hardly find a bed in the city, on returning late from Worcester. The day was very fine, and the sight of the streets, decorated with arches and flags and flowers and mottoes, and filled with well-dressed people, was a very pretty one. The ceremonies of the day consisted of a procession which extended for more than seven miles. It was more than three hours passing a given point. The Sims Brigade came first, of course, to protect the lieges from all assaults of their enemies. Then followed the State and civic Dignitaries and then the Trades with banners and emblems, and, many of them with platforms drawn by horses on which workmen were engaged in the manipulations of the various crafts. Of course, a good deal of advertising entered into this matter; but, still, it was a pretty sight,—especially the large array of stout men which followed in every trade, all well-dressed and apparently prosperous. A printing-press at which Franklin had worked was carried by the printers and a fac simile of the *Boston Courant* which was published in his name in 1723 was struck off as it went along and was distributed among the people. The authentic Electrical Machine was also exhibited with which he performed his famous experiments. The Masons and Knights Templars followed, "black, white and grey, with all their trumpery." An address was delivered in the square fronting the City Hall by Mr. Winthrop, in the course of which the flags which had concealed the Statue were lifted and it was revealed to sight. Other speeches, as usual in our Logocracy, crowned the occasion. I am sorry to say that, in my poor opinion, the Statue is by no means worthy of the pains and expense that were taken to procure and inaugurate it. It seems to me to want almost every quality that a statue of Franklin should express—dignity cheerful wisdom, genius, shrewdness or benevolence. Some or all of these qualities it strikes me the metal that bodies Franklin forth should have, for they all entered the composition of the man. But I could discern none of them in the face, the body or the posture of this his molten image. I think it hardly can enjoy the perpetuity Mr. Winthrop foretold for it. It must give way, sooner or later, to a worthier expression of the most illustrious of Americans. At least, this is my opinion and I give it to you for what it is worth.

I have no room left to speak of the Mechanics Exhibition or of the Horticultural Show,—neither of which, and much less both, can be despatched in this last end of a letter. If I do not forget them before I write again I may tell you something of them in my next letter. D. T.

From our Dublin Correspondent.

DUBLIN, Sept. 5, 1856.

MESSRS. EDITORS: I was lately favoured with a call from an American gentleman who, with money in his purse, cultivated tastes, good health, capacity of enjoyment, and the society of his own family, is making, at his ease, the delightful tour of Europe. Strange to say, he is not taking Ireland at a hop-skip-and-jump (from Glasgow to Belfast, thence to Dublin, and across to Liverpool), as most of the Americans do whom I have met with in the capacity of travellers. My friend takes his time—journeys from place to place, and is interested not merely by the beauty of the scenery—though a passionate admirer of the picturesque—but also by the condition and prospects of the people. He finds things much better with us here than he had been led to anticipate. The people are better clothed, look better fed, and our general aspect is much more hopeful than he previously supposed. He is greatly struck by the beauty of Dublin, the wide streets, the elegance of the public buildings, and the favourable contrast presented by the poorer districts of the city as compared with the corresponding parts of Glasgow and Edinburgh—where the narrow wynds and smothered up lanes and closes present you with an aspect of vicious squalour and nastiness, and a mingling of vile odours that are horrible to experience. The worst parts of Dublin are tumbling down; and whenever new streets are built, they are much wider and wholesomer than they used to be. Besides, everybody that can afford it sleeps out of town, and the number of this class rapidly increases. The country to the south of Dublin is built over to a degree that would make up a score of American cities. I mean that a very small clustre of houses sets up for a city in your free country, and that the suburban retreats of our citizens are so numerous and populous that they would readily make up a multitude of towns with transatlantic metropolitan pretensions.

But this patriotic glorification is taking me off my feet. I am not much given to it, so pray excuse me. It is a peccadillo that you will doubtless regard with merciful consideration.

As my visitor is an Abolitionist in a quiet way, and a well-to-do man of sense and education, I took the opportunity of asking how he regarded that grand dogma of the Garrisonians, "No Union with Slaveholders," and their demand for a Repeal of the Union between the Northern and the Southern States. He seems to think that, however desirable it may be for many reasons, it is simply impracticable in the nature of things. It is opposed, in the first place, to the opinions and prejudices of everybody in the Union, except the Garrisonians, and in the next by the intimate social intercourse between the North and South, and by the state of physical dependence in which they exist towards one another—the South wants the Northern manufactures, and the North the raw produce of the slave States. I know it is not the business of the Abolitionists to find a way out of their difficulties for those who are implicated in the guilt of slavery, whether in the free or slave States. Still, I question whether it is well to offer to the North a way by which she may escape from her anomalous position as an auxiliary to the Slave Power, unless that way commends itself to the people as practicable, besides being just. If you recommend a sufferer from the gout to cut off his limb, he may admit the effectiveness of your remedy, but he will probably suggest that whatever may be done with the offending member, a similar arrangement (and a very unpleasant one) would be very soon required for himself. If the North and the South are so bound together by religious, social and commercial as well as by political ties—if the railways, roads, and great natural features of the whole Union are such that almost everybody thinks they are inseparable—is it not desirable that the Abolitionists should turn their attention more than they have hitherto done to prove the practicability as well as the abstract justice and righteousness of their demand? If the South will keep her slaves—of which there seems at present every prospect—how will you divide the Mississippi?

If we can imagine England with her present institutions, enterprise, energy, cultivation and liberty, side by side with Russia with her semi-barbarism and her intense and ever-jealous despotism, the contrast could not be greater than that presented by the Union of your free with your slave States, supposing the North to be as true in her professed attachment to religion and liberty as the South unquestionably is to her peculiar institution. The North and the South cannot go on much longer together unless one side of Mason and Dixon's line knock under. If the North give way, how tremendous the concession. And if you cannot separate and cannot go on together, I wish you would tell me what you are to do? All the arguments I have read on the part of the Abolitionists demanding the dissolution of the Union appear to me incontrovertible, except that I can't see how the thing is possible. Would it not be well that some effort should be made to show its practicability? If a constant supply of green cheese suddenly became a necessary of life, and somebody were to publish an incontrovertible essay making it manifest that we must draw our supplies from the moon, I am afraid his paper and print would go for nothing and we must perish, unless he could also show us how to establish a communication. I only write for information. I think the Disunion Abolitionists are theoretically right. But there may be something more than an indifference to slavery, or a blind prejudice in favour of the Constitution and the Union, in the minds of many who regard a dissolution as a chimera. May they not look upon it as impracticable—as forbidden not merely by the prejudices and the opinions, and the natural circumstances, but by the physical geography of the country? There is little use in putting forward an opinion unless you can show that it is practicable as well as right. Now, for example, that the non-resistants, with the New Testament in their hands, are right, it seems to me absurd to deny; their views are in exact accordance with the precepts of the Sermon on the Mount. But much as people profess to venerate those teachings, where are the non-resistants? A mere handful—laughed at, and sometimes hated and despised. [By the way, I know of none who have hated and maligned them more than some highly professing members of that very religious Society which openly inculcates national though not individual non-resistance—which cheerfully pays the armed police and protests against whilst it pays the armed soldier.] I suppose the reason why Disunionists as well as non-resistants are so scarce will be found in the fact that by the great majority of all Americans, disunion as well as non-resistance is believed to be impracticable. Whether they are really so, is the question which those who plead for either are bound to gird up their loins and discuss with all their powers of argument.

Perhaps amongst all the travellers in an age abounding beyond all precedent in books of travels, no British writer has earned for himself a higher character as a philosophical observer than Samuel Laing, a gentleman of independent circumstances, and (I think) Chairman of one of the great English Railways and of the Sydenham Crystal Palace company. His "Journal of a Residence in Norway," "Tour in Sweden," Notes on the Social and Political State of France, Prussia, &c.," and "Observations on the Social and Political State of the European People in 1848 and 1849," are full of shrewdness and sagacity, and are amusing for the writer's undisguised contempt for theory and his stubborn determination to judge of all things by the test of experience. In the last chapter of the last work, he enters into a disquisition on the attempt that was made in 1848 by the Frankfort Parliament to form a political union of all Germany. He ridicules this project as preposterous. "In Germany," he says, "nature has denied, by her very bounty to each district or group of inhabitants, the means of connecting them into one nation. They have naturally no want of each other, are not obliged to exchange industry for industry with each other, have no products peculiar to one part of the country, and not to be obtained in another but by interchange—such, for instance, as wine in France, or coals in England—and without such mutual demand and supply and such common interests uniting them, a people cannot be a nation. They may be centralized under one government, but not nationalized. The German philosophers refer to the United States of America as a country of much greater extent than Germany, and yet completely nationalized and imbued with a common spirit and national feeling from end to end of their vast territories. But the United States are amalgamated into one nation by the same principle—their mutual material interests—as all other nations, and not by the identity of race and language. The Northern States, with their capital, commerce, shipping, and rising manufactures, supply the Southern States with what they cannot produce for themselves, and take their finer products of cotton, tobacco, rice, in exchange. "Carolina and Louisiana are more clearly and directly connected with New England or New York than any two contiguous provinces in Germany—than Holstein and Hanover, for instance, or Mecklenburg and Brunswick. The politicians who predict that some day the United States will fall asunder into separate kingdoms or republics, have not considered how closely they are united by their material interests. It is not more probable than that England should some day resolve itself into the Saxon Heptarchy."

Here you will observe that the very reasons which he adduces to show the impossibility of a permanent German union exist in full force to make a dissolution of the American Union impracticable. Now, my own views of the American Constitution are precisely those of the Garrison Abolitionists and of the overwhelming majority of the American people. I believe it was intended in many of its provisions to throw the protection of the Union over slavery, although it is probable that most of those who framed it supposed that the institution would speedily die out in the Southern as well as in the Northern States in the presence of Republican light and liberty. Holding this opinion, I do not see how the Abolitionists can avoid withholding all countenance from the Constitution and the Union. But I wish those who have time and talent would take a little pains to show their country and the world how that which they think ought to be done can be accomplished. Otherwise we are merely beating the air.

I had read "Dred" half way through when I took up my pen to write this letter, which proves either that Mrs. Stowe's new book is not as absorbing as a novel ought to be, or that I am your devoted correspondent. In truth, I don't think this last book is likely to take the world by storm, like the first. To be sure, the new hero hardly comes upon the stage till the piece is nearly all over, and your feelings are not enlisted from the very outset in his favour, as in the case of "Uncle Tom." And then the heroine, Miss Nina, though not commonplace, looks more like the theme of an ordinary novel than the characters who revolve round the dear old martyr of the Red River. The book is full of good things—but I think more of Mrs. Stowe as I read than of her characters. It is better as a picture of her own mind than of any other. I fear it will get her into trouble, it is so full of self-assertion and of intellectual independence. Things are come to a strange pass when the daughter, wife and sister of so many ministers writes a book filled with the liberty of unlicensed thinking. Dred is published at two shillings and sixpence (60 cents) and at six shillings (144 cents). I am told that the cheaper edition was sold immediately, and another is promised in a few days. The *Athenæum* gives a virulent and exceedingly depreciatory criticism, which I attribute to ill will against the authoress for having carried the public with her when "Uncle Tom" swept over the land, in defiance of the judgment of that mighty arbiter of literary fame in England. Critics are like Jonah—they hate to have their vaticinations disappointed, no matter how much their fulfilment would afflict the poor author. The *Athenæum* opens with a flourish of self-glorification about English anti-slavery and ends in a strain that shows he has not occupied an idle seat at the feet of American pro-slavery journalists, who swarm throughout Great Britain, inoculating with their active venom the skin-deep antipathy to your peculiar institution which is so common amongst us.

Yours truly, RICHARD D. WEBB.

Summary.

John G. Saxe, the Vermont poet, is prostrated by paralysis, and has been confined to his house with it since last Winter.

Some three hundred booksellers, in attendance upon Leavitt & Delisser's trade sales, paid respects to Col. Fremont, at his residence a few days since in this city.

A Frightened Doughface writes from Maine to the Boston *Post*: "Heaven only knows whither we are tending. The 3,000 in-the-name-of-Almighty-God clergymen of New England are preconcertedly bent upon effecting mischief."

GERRIT SMITH.—Peter Page, Esq., of Chicago, has received from Gerrit Smith a draft of $4,000 contributed to the Kansas fund for the relief of the struggling Free State men. This makes the sum of $9,000 given by Mr. Smith to the Free Kansas cause since the 15th of June.

LOOKING FOR THE UNDERGROUND RAILROAD.—The *Memphis Evening News* relates that a negro fireman, employed on the Somerville Branch Railroad, stole the locomotive, Saturday morning, and taking on seven or eight other negroes, ran away with it to within twelve miles of that city, when they left it and took to the woods.

FREE SPEECH AT THE SOUTH.—On the 18th ult., a vote was taken on a little steamer running between Nashville, Tenn., and Smithland, Ky., resulting as follows: Buchanan 68; Fillmore 34; Fremont 1. The Fremont voter was Goeth Hunn, of Quincy, Illinois. It so exasperated the Buchaners and Fremonters that they compelled him, by force, to leave the boat at Clarksville, Tenn.

A. N. Niles, the Postmaster at Georgetown, in this State, writes thus to the *Tribune*:

"I was yesterday notified by a swearing Government official that I am to be removed from the Post-Office here, for my letter in *The Tribune*, of July 16. But upon looking about for a Buchanan man to take the office, there was none to be found. There is but one Buchanan man in the place, and he is a deaf blacksmith, who would also have been a Fremonter had he been able to hear the truth."

Col. J. B. Thornton, in a speech at Memphis lately, stated that there were three hundred Fremont men in that city, for which he was vehemently denounced. *Toulke's Financial Express*, a non-political paper published at Memphis, expresses its "honest and fixed conviction" that there are in Memphis 500 voters in the city and County who would vote for Fremont in preference to "either of the other candidates if there were a Fremont ticket in the field."

Mr. William T. Coleman, President of the San Francisco Vigilance Committee, was arrested here last week, at the instigation of James R. Maloney, late of California, who complains that while performing his duty in guarding the State arms, he was seized and finally expelled the State by the Committee to his great personal and pecuniary damage. Mr. Coleman, who is now on a temperary visit to this section of the country, was taken before the Supreme Court, and held to answer in the sum of fifty thousand dollars.

PRESIDENTIAL PROSCRIPTION IN KANSAS.—Thomas C. Shoemaker, Receiver of Public Moneys in Kansas Territory, the only Free State man among all the Federal office-holders in that Territory, has been removed. Mr. Shoemaker was a Democrat, a friend of Judge Douglas from Illinois, and was the only Federal office-holder in Kansas Territory who was not subjugated and stripped of his manhood and independence by the border ruffian Administration. Mr. Shoemaker will take the stump in Illinois, and give a full exemplification of modern Democracy in Kansas.

FREMONT'S CATHOLICISM—AN EXPLICIT DENIAL.—*Washington, D. C., Saturday, Aug. 16, 1856.*—MY DEAR SIR: *I am authorized by Col. Fremont* to deny, in the most positive language, the report now in circulation, to the effect that he is a Roman Catholic.

From a long and intimate acquaintance with Col. Fremont, I will further add that I know, of my own knowledge, that he has never had any connection whatever with the Catholic Church or the Catholic religion. G. W. WRIGHT.

Hon. RICHARD MOTT, House of Representatives.

PETITION OF COLOURED PEOPLE.—The Boston *Transcript* says that on Monday, in the Board of Aldermen, a petition was received from John S. Rock, G. M. Salter, Lewis Hayden, Coffin Pitts, Seth Dobbs, Samuel Shepley, and other coloured citizens, praying that the word "coloured," which now stands against their names on the voting lists and tax bills, may be removed, and that they may stand as fair on the record as any of their white fellow-citizens. The petition was opposed by Alderman Plummer, who held that the designation was necessary, on account of there being many white and coloured men of the same name, and without some mark no one could tell which was which. The petition was tabled.

DESPERATE RUNAWAY SLAVES.—The peculiar institution don't seem to flourish in the Old Dominion. Hampshire County papers give particulars of the desperate resistance offered by a party of runaway negroes to their pursuers. The following is the story:

A party of men from Frederick County arrested eight of a party of ten negroes, runaways from Fauquier County, near Bloomery, on the borders of Hampshire County. The negroes showed fight, were well armed with guns, &c. A desperate fellow drew his gun on Mr. Coohus, the muzzle nearly touching Mr. C.'s breast, the gun missed fire, at the same time Mr. C. snapped a pistol at the negro—the negro dropped his gun, drew a butcher's knife, and made at Mr. C., when another of Mr. C.'s party came up and knocked the fellow down with a stone, when he was secured. The other fellows were arrested after a show of resistance. Two of the party escaped. The negroes were lodged in jail at Romney.

THE RICHEST SELL YET.—The New York *Express* published an account of a German meeting at the Tabernacle, and the procession which followed it. The *Express* spent $2 in wood cuts, which they bought of W. H. Levison of the *Picayune*, and ridiculed the Germans in the most abominable manner. The next day the *Express* announced that they were obliged to print a larger edition to supply the demand. The cat is now out of the bag. The *Express* did print 15,000 extra, but they were ordered and paid for by an agent of the Central Fremont Committee. Ten thousand were given away gratituously among the German voters in the 11th and 17th wards of this city, the other 5,000 were sent to Pennsylvania.—*N. Y. Register.*

We have a tale to mate with this. A warm Fremont man in a neighbouring village having received a lot of the documents published by Greeley & McElrath, entitled "James Buchanan as exhibited by himself and his friends," took them to a Buchanan stronghold near by, and disposed of them to some fifty hot Buchanan men as genuine Buchanan documents! They will answer his recommendation, being made up of extracts from the speeches and writings of Buchanan and his friends; but we look for an increase of the Fremont vote in that last place.—*Hartford Press.*

AN INCIDENT.—The little girl purchased and redeemed from slavery by the eloquent and gifted Sumner was at the meeting at Littleton, on the 10th, and was there introduced to the vast assembly by the Hon. Mason W. Tappan, M. C., from the Second District from our State. She is as beautiful a child as can be found anywhere, without a suspicion of African blood in her veins, or the slightest mark of the odious institution in any respect. Mr. Tappan, in simple and touching, yet eloquent language, related the story of her wrongs, until he was so overcome by the noblest and most manly feelings of our nature that he could not for some moments articulate a word. The whole assembly deeply sympathized with him, and the tear was seen to start from the eyes of hundreds of his hearers, coursing their way down many a cheek, bronzed in the battle of life among the hills of Northern New Hampshire and Vermont. Thousands in that gathering, who hung breathless upon every syllable uttered by the noble Tappan, again swore undying hostility henceforth and forever to every form of oppression over the minds and bodies of down-trodden humanity. Said one man, far past the meridian of life, "*I have steadily voted the Democratic ticket for thirty-six years, and have never flinched until this moment*, BUT I CAN STAND THIS NO LONGER, AND JOHN C. FREMONT IS SURE OF ONE MORE VOTE THAN HE WAS THIS MORNING." Scores of better and kindlier portion of our opponents left the ground that day with a like determination. It was a moving and affecting scene, and will tell for generations upon the vote of Northern New-Hampshire.—*Independent Democrat.*

A FREE SOILER BANISHED FROM ALABAMA.—We learn from the *Livingston* (Ala.) *Messenger*, of the 10th inst., that a public meeting was held in that town on the 3d, for the purpose of considering the case of Samuel Sharood, charged with being an Abolitionist, and having on sundry occasions tampered with the negroes in the town and neighbourhood.

The meeting was conducted in a very dignified and orderly manner, several witnesses being examined, whose testimony clearly proved the charges against Sharood. The individual was then allowed to be heard in his own defence. He acknowledged that he had been an Abolitionist, but since he had been at Livingston his views on the subject had undergone a change; he had associated a good deal with negroes, and had spoken to them often on the subject of slavery, but did not know that there was any harm in it; in conclusion, he affirmed his complete conversion to the slavery side of the question.

After he had concluded his defence, which was extremely lame, a resolution was offered and carried, that he be warned to leave the County within three days, and that if he should fail to do so within the time specified, he should be further proceeded against.

The meeting then adjourned, and Mr. Sharood left for parts unknown.

The *Messenger* gives the following description of the gentleman:

Mr. Sharood is a native of England, journeyman tailor by trade, twenty-five years old, 5 feet 7 or 8 inches high, dark eyes, fair skin, and exhibits great devotion as a member of the Methodist Church. He is a fugitive from the English army, and we *cheerfully* recommend him to the good citizens of Boston or Albany.

Special Notices.

☞ SIXTH NATIONAL WOMAN'S RIGHTS CONVENTION.—In this epoch of political and social excitement, the advocacies of Equal Rights of Woman find new reason to proclaim again their constant demand for a consistent application of democratic principles, for the emancipation not alone of one class or one nation, but of one half the human race.

We accordingly invite

All who believe that Government derives its just powers from the consent of the governed;

All who believe that Taxation and Representation should go together;

All who believe in the right of all to a Trial by a Jury of their Peers;

All who believe in a fair day's wages for a fair day's work;

All who believe in the equal right of all children in the community to its public provisions for education;

To meet in Convention at the Broadway Tabernacle, New York, on the 8th, 9

Miscellaneous Department.

OLIVER CROMWELL.

FROM HIS YOUTH TO PARLIAMENT.

The great-grandfather of the Protector was a person who was designated in legal documents as "Richard Cromwell *alias* Williams," and the same alias continued in the family down to the time of Oliver, who sometimes made use of it in his younger days. Two letters are extant addressed by Richard Cromwell to the famous Thomas Cromwell, Earl of Essex, the Vicar-General of Henry VIII., and in both of them he subscribes himself "your most bounden nephew." In one of these epistles he expresses his devotion to the service of the Earl, adding "as *nature* and also your manifold kindness bindeth." To account for the alias of Richard Cromwell, and his relationship to his more celebrated namesake, it has been asserted that his father was a Williams, who married the sister of the future Vicar-General, and subsequently called himself after the prosperous house with which he had contracted an alliance. Of this marriage there is no trustworthy evidence, and when Bishop Goodman, in a dedication to the Protector, alluded to his connection with the minister of Henry VIII., Cromwell replied, "my family has no relation to his." The denial is countenanced by the circumstance that a Sir William Williams married one of the daughters of the Lord Cromwell who lived in the reign of Henry VI., and was the last heir male of his line. The conjunction of the names of Williams and Cromwell would be thus explained by a real instead of a doubtful marriage; and the Earl of Essex, whose father was a blacksmith, may have been glad to discover a kinsman in a race of higher lineage than his own, while his "most bounden nephew"—a term said not to have been strictly applied in those days to a brother's or sister's son—may, on his part, have welcomed the claim for the sake of the substantial benefits it was to bring. These he enjoyed in an unusual degree. He was knighted by Henry VIII., and on the suppression of the monasteries, which was the great work of his namesake, received enormous grants of church lands. Among other prizes which fell to his share he obtained the estate and nunnery of Hinchinbrook, near Huntingdon, and here his son, Sir Henry, who was knighted by Queen Elizabeth, built the present mansion. Sir Henry, called for his riches and liberality the "Golden Knight," died in 1603, and Oliver, the uncle after whom the Protector was named, became Lord of Hinchinbrook. The year in which he inherited his estate was the same in which James I. succeeded to the English crown, and the King was his guest for two days during the royal progress from Scotland to London. The entertainment was reported to be the most sumptuous which a subject had ever given to his sovereign, and even if the new monarch had been as sparing as he was lavish of his honours, he could not have left the hospitable roof without bidding his host rise up Sir Oliver.

In addition to Sir Oliver, the "Golden Knight" left five sons and five daughters. It is a singular circumstance that from his children should have sprung the two most famous leaders in the Great Rebellion, for his second daughter was the mother of Hampden, as his second son, Robert, was the father of the Protector. Another curious circumstance is that Robert married a widow, Mrs. Lynne, whose maiden name was Steward, and who came of the royal race. The fact is now established beyond question that Charles I. and Oliver Cromwell were distant cousins. The Protector certainly did not exaggerate his descent when he said, in a speech to his first Parliament, "I was by birth a gentleman; living neither in any considerable height, nor yet in obscurity."

Robert Cromwell settled at Huntingdon, where he had an estate and a brewery. The first, which is computed by Mr. Carlyle to have been equivalent to a thousand a year at the present day, he farmed himself, and the second is reported to have been managed by his wife. Oliver, their fifth child, and the only one of their sons who lived to manhood, was born April 25th, 1599. He was educated at the grammar-school of Huntingdon, by Dr. Beard, the author of the "Theatre of God's Judgments." The traditions of his boyhood are at best of uncertain truth, and of as little importance. He is alleged to have been forward in robbing orchards and dovecots, and to have loved practical jokes. Unless his character changed greatly in after years, he was undoubtedly a lad of spirit, and, being possessed of unbounded daring, was likely to have played whatever pranks are usual among boys. On the 23d of April, 1616, when he was seventeen years of age, he was entered at Sydney-Sussex College, Cambridge. His father died in June, 1617, and Oliver, now his own master, left the University. The royalists, who wrote of him after his death, asserted that while he remained he neglected study for foot-ball, quarter-staff and drinking. Either at school, however, or afterwards, he acquired sufficient Latin to speak it during his Protectorship to foreign ambassadors. This he did, Burnet says, "very viciously and scantily;" but to have retained the art at all at the close of a life which had been spent like his, he must have made respectable progress in his youth. His letters and speeches preclude the idea of greater proficiency. No man who was deeply versed in any description of literature could have written such barbarous and inaccurate English.

Shortly after he withdrew from Cambridge he went to London to study the law, but continued idle and dissipated. Without attaching too much weight to particular incidents, there is reason for rejecting the general testimony that he was, what Baxter calls him, "a prodigal in his youth." In this he resembles his celebrated cousin, Hampden, who, according to Clarendon, "had, from a life of great pleasure and license, on a sudden retired to extraordinary sobriety and strictness." Oliver's wild oats were quickly sown, if his marriage on the 22d of August, 1620, to Elizabeth, the daughter of Sir James Bourchier, of Felstead, in Essex, may be considered as an evidence of his reformation. The wedding took place in London, at St. Giles' Church, Cripplegate, and the young couple went to live at Huntingdon. The ordinary occupations of Cromwell were now the management of his farm and brewery, but he made himself of such importance in public affairs that his townsmen elected him to represent them in the memorable Parliament of Charles I., which was summoned in 1628.

The two previous parliaments which Charles had assembled since his accession to the throne in 1625 had been hastily dissolved. The object of the King was to get money; the object of the Commons to obtain a redress of grievances. They made compliance with their demands the condition of voting the supplies, and Charles, rather than consent to these terms, impatiently dismissed them. Deprived of the usual subsidies, he attempted to fill the exchequer by forced loans, and met with indifferent success. For the third time he was compelled to have recourse to the representatives of the nation, who conscious of his necessities and their own power, took their stand upon their old ground. They drew up the famous "Petition of Right," of which the first clause declared all loans and taxes not sanctioned by Parliament to be contrary to law. The King, compelled to forego the promised supplies, or to sanction a bill which would tie his hands for the future, substituted an evasive reply for the invariable form in which the sovereign gives assent to acts of Parliament. The resolute Commons were preparing a fresh remonstrance, when on the 4th of June they received a message from his Majesty, that, as he intended to terminate the session in a week, "they must husband time, and despatch old business without entertaining new." The Commons persevering in the new business as the surest means of concluding the old, the message was repeated next day, with the addition that they were "not to cast aspersions on any minister of the state." A scene ensued which paints vividly the intense excitement produced by the contest. Sir Robert Philips rose, "and mingled his words with weeping." Pym followed, and "did the like." Sir Edward Coke, the oracle of the law, who was now in his seventy-ninth year, and who is better known to us by his inhumanity than his tenderness, endeavoured to deliver his sentiments, "and was forced to sit down by the abundance of tears." The Speaker had occasion to interpose, and he, too, wept. The House resolved itself into a committee, and the old patriarch of the law, whose voice had been choked with emotion, had by this time recovered sufficient composure to give utterance to the thought which was in every man's mind. He did not know, he said, whether he should ever again speak in that place, and he would now do it freely —"The author of all their miseries was the Duke of Buckingham." This was the dreaded aspersion which the King had endeavoured to prevent; but the House answered to the bold avowal of Sir Edward Coke by a joyful acclamation; and, "as, when one good hound," wrote Thomas Alured, the member for Malton, "recovers the scent, the rest come in with full cry, so we pursued it." The Speaker, relieved of his functions by the chairman of the committee, had gone straight to the King to inform him of what was passing. He was absent three hours, and returned at the moment that it was being put to the vote that the "Duke of Buckingham shall be instanced to be the chief and principal cause of all the evils." He brought an order for the adjournment of the House till the following morning, which the Commons obeyed; but on the ensuing day the hounds were not to be diverted from the scent, and Charles, dreading lest they should run down his favourite, gave, a day or two afterwards, an unconditional assent to the "Petition of Right." The Commons received it with a rapture of applause, and the rejoicings extended through the land. Still the hounds kept to the scent, and the House ended by presenting a remonstrance to the King, in which they charged the grievances of the nation upon Buckingham, and urged his dismissal. Charles replied by prorogueing the Parliament.

The custom-house duties, or, as they were then called, tonnage and poundage, had since the time of Henry VI. been granted to successive sovereigns for life. The Commons in the first Parliament of Charles I. voted them only for a year, and the Lords, who wished to adhere to precedent, threw out the bill. The King, amid much resistance and discontent, had continued to levy them since, without authority; and it was in the hope of obtaining the usual grant that he reassembled in January, 1629, the Parliament he had prorogued in the previous June. The knife of the assassin had removed one great cause of dissension in the interval. In August the Duke of Buckingham had been murdered by Felton. But the settled opinions of the King himself were at variance with those of the representatives of the people; and the moment they came into contact the suspended struggle recommenced. Charles urged the prosecution of the act for tonnage and poundage; the Commons persisted in giving the priority to grievances. In particular, they commenced a rigid inquisition into ecclesiastical abuses, and this was the subject on which the voice of Cromwell was first heard in Parliament.—*London Quarterly Review.*

GILBERT A'BECKETT.

From The London Daily News, September 3.

The death of a very gifted man—which we have recorded—cannot be passed by in silence. Mr. A'Beckett, the son of a solicitor in extensive practice, was educated at Westminster School, and was launched at a remarkably early age into the excitement of that profession of which he became a conspicuous ornament. Gifted with a wondrous and peculiar humour, even as a boy, he started comic periodicals with his schoolfellow, Mr. Henry Mayhew, and was dealing with public reputations at an age when most youths confine their ambition to the delicacies of knuckling down, or the diplomacy of peg-in-the-ring. Before he had reached man's estate, he had seen many periodicals rise and fall under the auspices of himself and his literary partner; some having obtained a temporary success, others having failed at once. But undoubtedly the great success of the two boys was *Figaro*—the journal which, it may be fairly said, prepared the public mind for the appearance of our prosperous friend *Punch*; upon which they were destined to found a lasting reputation.

The fortunes of *Punch* are patent to the world: and with them the name of Mr. A'Beckett is inseparably associated. The jovial spirit in which Mr. Dunup has borne his adverse fortunes; the fun found in Blackstone; the showers of *jeux-de-mots* in the "Comic History of England"; the weekly comments of exquisite humour on passing events, in which the touch is unmistakable—and then the genial, simple spirit of the writer—these are among the claims by which the name of A'Beckett will be remembered in the literary history of the century. As one of the originators of that wise fun which has distinguished the periodical literature of the present time, he must hold a conspicuous place; while thousands who remember sly hits and droll turns of thought, and exquisite plays upon words, that bear his name as author, will also remember, as a charm, that none of them were unjust, and none of them telling by their ill-nature. He was before all a just man, who never allowed his moral sense to be distorted by his wit, and who never slaughtered a name with its irresistible ridicule while he believed that name to be honourable.

Few men could have held the two opposite positions he occupied—as metropolitan magistrate and *Punch* contributor—without incurring charges of incompetency on the one hand, or snobism on the other. Mr. A'Beckett was a wise magistrate and a conscientious contributor. He buckled bravely to his magisterial duties, while he cherished an affection for the periodical in which he had won his way. It was his delight to have at least a few lines in every number of *Punch*.

Mr. A'Beckett must not be judged, however, simply as a contributor to *Punch*, and therefore as a man who never devoted himself to solid and serious work. It should be widely known that for some time his light and vigorous pen was in the service of the *Times* newspaper, and that he contributed to the leading columns of that journal some of the more remarkable articles it has put forth. Indeed, on one day, the whole of the leading columns of the *Times* were the production of the gentleman whose death we now deplore. Entrusted by the late Charles Buller with an inquiry into the iniquities practised at the Andover Union, Mr. A'Beckett framed so masterly a report that he was at once recognised as a man of clear and sound judgment, who combined with this valuable qualification the power of explaining his views in language at once brilliant and vigorous. His Andover leaders in the *Times* are articles to which reference is still constantly made. The genius with which the Andover question was treated gave Mr. A'Beckett strong claims upon the gratitude of the country, and secured for him the metropolitan magistracy, which he has held with honour and dignity during the last seven years.

An earnest, a wise, a hearty and a kindly man has passed from among us, and we note his loss with sorrow. It is something to say that a man so largely gifted with the power to wound leaves no scar behind him, and that all men of letters now living unite in acknowledging the ability of the writer, while his personal intimates bear witness to his goodness as a friend, and to his devotion to his domestic circle. He has left a widow, whose gifts as a musician are not unknown to the world, to deplore his sudden death, and children to bear a name upon which he has gathered many honours, against which there is not a word of reproach.

A NIGHT ON BEN LOMOND.*

BY MARGARET FULLER.

The first day at Rowardennan not being propitious for ascending the mountain, we went down the lake to sup, and got very tired in various ways, so that we rose very late next morning. Then we found a day of ten thousand for our purpose; but unhappily a large party had come with the sun and engaged all the horses, so that, if we went, it must be on foot. This was something of an enterprise for me, as the ascent is four miles, and toward the summit quite fatiguing; however, in the pride of newly-gained health and strength, I was ready, and set forth with Mr. S. alone. We took no guide—and the people of the house did not advise it, as they ought. They told us afterward they thought the day was so clear that there was no probability of danger, and they were afraid of seeming mercenary about it. It was, however, wrong, as they knew what we did not, that even the shepherds, if a mist comes on, can be lost in these hills; that a party of gentlemen were so a few weeks before, and only by accident found their way to a house on the other side; and that a child which had been lost was not found for five days, long after its death. We, however, nothing doubting, set forth, ascending slowly, and often stopping to enjoy the points of view, which are many; for Ben Lomond consists of a congeries of hills, above which towers the true Ben, or highest peak, as the head of a many-limbed body.

On reaching the peak, the sight was one of beauty and grandeur, such as imagination never painted. You see around you no plain ground, but on every side constellations or groups of hills exquisitely dressed in the soft purple of the heather, amid which gleam the lakes, like eyes that tell the secrets of the earth and drink in those of the heavens. Peak beyond peak caught from the shifting light all the colours of the prism, and on the farthest, angel companies seemed hovering in their glorious white robes.

Words are idle on such subjects; what can I say, but that it was a noble vision, that satisfied the eye, and stirred the imagination in all its secret pulses. Had that been, as afterwards seemed likely, the last act of my life, there could not have been a finer decoration painted on the curtain which was to drop upon it.

About four o'clock we began our descent. Near the summit the traces of the path are not distinct, and I said to Mr. S., after a while, that we had lost it. He said he thought that was of no consequence, we could find our way down. I thought, however, it was, as the ground was full of springs, that were bridged over in the pathway. He accordingly went to look for it, and I stood still, because so tired that I did not like to waste any labour. Soon he called to me that he had found it, and I followed in the direction where he seemed to be. But I mistook, overshot it, and saw him no more. In about ten minutes I become alarmed, and called him many times. It seems he on his side did the same, but the brow of some hill was between us, and we neither saw nor heard one another.

I then thought I would make the best of my way down, and I should find him upon my arrival. But in doing so I found the justice of my apprehension about the springs, as, so soon as I got to the foot of the hills, I would sink up to my knees in bog, and have to go up the hills again, seeking better crossing-places. Thus I lost much time; nevertheless, in the twilight I saw at last the lake, and the inn of Rowardennan on its shore.

Between me and it lay direct a high heathery hill which I afterward found is called "The Tongue," because hemmed in on three sides by a watercourse. It looked as if, could I only get to the bottom of that, I should be on comparatively level ground. I then attempted to descend in the watercourse, but finding that impracticable, climbed on the hill again and let myself down by the heather, for it was very steep and full of deep holes. With great fatigue I got to the bottom, but when about to cross the watercourse there, it looked so deep in the dim twilight that I felt afraid. I got down as far as I could by the root of a tree, and threw down a stone; it sounded very hollow, and made me afraid to jump. The shepherds told me afterwards, if I had, I should probably have killed myself, it was so deep and the bed of the torrent full of sharp stones.

I then tried to ascend the hill again, for there was no other way to get off it, but soon sunk down utterly exhausted. When able to get up again and look about me, it was completely dark. I saw far below me a light, that looked about as big as a pin's head, which I knew to be from the inn at Rowardennan, but heard no sound except the rush of the waterfall, and the sighing of the night wind.

For the first few minutes after I perceived I had got to my night's lodging, such as it was, the prospect seemed appalling. I was very slightly clad—my feet and dress were very wet—I had only a little shawl to throw round me, and a cold Autumn wind had already come, and the night-mist was to fall on me, all fevered and exhausted as I was. I thought I should not live through the night, or, if I did, live always a miserable invalid. There was no chance to keep myself warm, for, now it was dark, it would be too dangerous to stir.

My only chance, however, lay in motion, and my only help in myself, and so convinced was I of this, that I did keep in motion the whole of that long night, imprisoned as I was on such a little perch of that great mountain. *How* long it seemed under such circumstances only those can guess who may have been similarly circumstanced. The mental experience of the time, most precious and profound,—for it was indeed a season lonely, dangerous, and helpless enough for the birth of thoughts beyond what the common sunlight will ever call to being—may be told in another place and time.

For about two hours I saw the stars, and very cheery and companionable they looked; but then the mist fell, and I saw nothing more, except such apparitions as visited Ossian on the hill-side, when he went out by night and struck the bosky shield, and called to him the spirits of the heroes and the white-armed maids with their blue eyes of grief. To me, too, came those visionary shapes; floating slowly and gracefully, their white robes would unfurl from the great body of mist in which they had been engaged, and come upon me with a kiss pervasively cold as that of death. What they might have told me, who knows, if I had but resigned myself more passively to that cold, spirit-like breathing!

At last the moon rose. I could not see her, but the silver light filled the mist. Then I knew it was two o'clock, and that, having weathered out so much of the night, I might rest; and the hours hardly seemed long to me more.

It may give an idea of the extent of the mountain, to say that, though I called every now and then with all my force, in case by chance some aid might be near, and though no less than twenty men with their dogs were looking for me, I never heard a sound except the rush of the waterfall and the sighing of the night wind, and once or twice the startling of the grouse in the heather. It was sublime indeed—a never-to-be-forgotten presentation of stern, serene realities.

At last came the signs of day, the gradual clearing and breaking up; some faint sounds, from I know not what. The little flies, too, arose from their bed amid the purple heather, and bit me; truly they were very welcome to do so. But what was my disappointment to find the mist so thick, that I could neither see lake nor inn, nor anything to guide me. I had to go by guess, and as it happened, my Yankee method served me well. I ascended the hill, crossed the torrent in the waterfall, first drinking some of the water, which was as good at that time as ambrosia. I crossed in that place, because the waterfall made steps, as it were, to the next hill; to be sure they were covered with water, but I was already entirely wet with the mist, so that it did not matter. I then kept on scrambling, as it happened, in the right direction, till, about seven, some of the shepherds found me. The moment they came, all my feverish strength departed, though, if unaided, I dare say it would have kept me up during the day; and they carried me home, where my arrival relieved my friends of distress far greater than I had undergone, for I had had my grand solitude, my Ossianic visions, and the pleasure of sustaining myself, while they had only doubt amounting to anguish and a fruitless search through the night.

Entirely contrary to my expectations, I only suffered for this a few days, and was able to take a parting look at my prison, as I went down the lake with feelings of complacency. It was a majestic-looking hill, that Tongue, with the deep ravines on either side, and the richest robe of heather I have seen anywhere.

Mr. S. gave all the men who were looking for me a dinner in the barn, and he and Mrs. S. ministered to them, and they talked of Burns, really the national writer, and known by them, apparently, as none other is, and of hair-breadth escapes by flood and field. Afterward they were all brought up to see me, and it was pleasing indeed to observe the good breeding and good feeling with which they deported themselves on the occasion. Indeed, this adventure created quite an intimate feeling between us and the people there. I had been much pleased with them before, in attending one of their dances, on account of the genuine independence and politeness of their conduct. They were willing and pleased to dance their Highland flings and strathspeys for our amusement, and did it as naturally and as freely as they would have offered the stranger the best chair.

** From "At Home and Abroad." By Margaret Fuller Ossoli.*

R. W. EMERSON AND THE ENGLISH LITERATI.

In these comments on an old journey now revised after seven busy years have much changed men and things in England, I have abstained from reference to persons, except in the last chapter, and in one or two cases where the fame of the parties seemed to have given the public a property in all that concerned them. I must further allow myself a few notices, if only as an acknowledgment of debts that cannot be paid. My journeys were cheered by so much kindness from new friends, that my impression of the island is bright with agreeable memories both of public societies and of households: and, what is nowhere better found than in England, a cultivated person fitly surrounded by a happy home, "with honour, love, obedience, troops of friends," is of all institutions the best. At the landing in Liverpool, I found my Manchester correspondent awaiting me, a gentleman whose kind reception was followed by a train of friendly and effective attentions which never rested whilst I remained in the country. A man of sense and of letters, the editor of a powerful local journal, he added to solid virtues an infinite sweetness and *bon hommie*. There seemed a pool of honey about his heart which lubricated all his speech and action with fine jets of mead. An equal good fortune attended many later accidents of my journey, until the sincerity of English kindness ceased to surprise. My visit fell in the fortunate days when Mr. Bancroft was the American Minister in London, and at his house, or through his good offices, I had easy access to excellent persons and privileged places. At the house of Mr. Carlyle, I met persons eminent in society and in letters. The privileges of the Athenæum and the Reform Clubs were hospitably opened to me, and I found much advantage in the circles of the "Geologic," the "Antiquarian" and the "Royal Societies." Every day in London gave me new opportunities of meeting men and women who give splendour to society. I saw Rogers, Hallam, Macaulay, Mines, Millman, Barry Cornwall, Dickens, Thackeray, Tennyson, Leigh Hunt, D'Israeli, Helps, Wilkinson, Bailey, Kenyon and Forster; the younger poets, Clough, Arnold and Patmore; and, among the men of science, Robert Brown, Owen, Sedgwick, Faraday, Buckland, Lyell, De La Beche, Hooker, Carpenter, Babbage and Edward Forbes. It was my privilege also to converse with Miss Baillie, with Lady Morgan, with Mrs. Jameson and Mrs. Somerville. A finer hospitality made many private houses not less known and dear. It is not in distinguished circles that wisdom and elevated characters are usually found, or, if found, not confined thereto; and my recollections of the best hours go back to private conversations in different parts of the kingdom, with persons little known. Nor am I insensible to the courtesy which frankly opened to me some noble mansions, if I do not adorn my page with their names. Among the privileges of London, I recall with pleasure two or three signal days —one at Kew, where Sir William Hooker showed me all the riches of the vast botanic garden; one at the Museum, where Sir Charles Fellowes explained in detail the history of his Ionic trophy-monument; and still another, on which Mr. Owen accompanied my countryman Mr. H. and myself through the Hunterian Museum.

The like frank hospitality, bent on real service, I found among the great and the humble, wherever I went: In Birmingham, in Oxford, in Leicester, in Nottingham, in Sheffield, in Manchester, in Liverpool. At Edinburgh, through the kindness of Dr. Samuel Brown, I made the acquaintance of De Quincy, of Lord Jeffrey, of Wilson, of Mrs. Crowe, of the Messrs. Chambers, and of a man of high character and genius, the short-lived painter, David Scott.

At Ambleside, in March, 1848, I was for a couple of days the guest of Miss Martineau, then newly returned from her Egyptian tour. On Sunday afternoon I accompanied her to Rydal Mount. And as I have recorded a visit to Wordsworth, many years before, I must not forget this second interview. We found Mr. Wordsworth asleep on the sofa. He was at first silent and indisposed, as an old man suddenly waked before he had ended his nap; but soon became full of talk on the French news. He was nationally bitter on the French; bitter on the Scotchmen, too. No Scotchman, he said, can write English. He detailed the two models, on one or the other of which all the sentences of the historian Robertson are framed. Nor could Jeffrey, nor the Edinburgh Reviewers write English, nor can * * *, who is a pest to the English tongue. Incidentally he added, Gibbon cannot write English. The *Edinburgh Review* wrote what would tell and what would sell. It had, however, changed the tone of its literary criticism from the time when a certain letter was written to the editor by Coleridge. Mrs. Wordsworth had the Editor's answer in her possession. Tennyson he thinks a right poetic genius, though with some affectation. He had thought an elder brother of Tennyson at first the better poet, but must now reckon Alfred the true one. . . . In speaking of I know not what style, he said, "to be sure, it was the manner, but then you know the matter always comes out of the manner." . . . He thought Rio Janeiro the best place in the world for a great capital city. . . . We talked of English national character. I told him, it was not creditable that no one in all the country knew anything of Thomas Taylor, the Platonist, whilst in every American library his translations are found. I said if Plato's Republic were published in England as a new book to-day, do you think it would find any readers? He confessed, it would not; "and yet," he added after a pause, with that complacency which never deserts a true-born Englishman, "and yet we have embodied it all."

His opinions of French, English, Irish and Scotch seemed rashly formulized from little anecdotes of what had befallen himself and members of his family, in a diligence or stage-coach. His face sometimes lighted up, but his conversation was not marked by special force or elevation. Yet perhaps it is a high compliment to the cultivation of the English generally, when we find such a man not distinguished. He had a healthy look, with a weather-beaten face, his face corrugated, especially the large nose.

Miss Martineau, who lived near him, praised him to me, not for his poetry, but for thrift and economy; for having afforded to his country neighbours an example of a modest household, where comfort and culture were secured without any display. She said, that in his early house-keeping at the cottage where he first lived, he was accustomed to offer his friends bread and plainest fare: if they wanted anything more, they must pay him for their board. It was the rule of the house. I replied that it evinced English pluck more than any anecdote I knew. A gentleman in the neighbourhood told the story of Walter Scott's staying once for a week with Wordsworth, and slipping out every day under pretence of a walk, to the Swan Inn, for cold cut and porter; and one day passing with Wordsworth the inn, he was betrayed by the landlord's asking him if he had come for his porter. Of course, this trait would have another look in London, and there you will hear from different literary men, that Wordsworth had no personal friend, that he was not amiable, that he was parsimonious, etc. Landor, always generous, says that he never praised anybody. A gentleman in London showed me a watch that once belonged to Milton, whose initials are engraved on its face. He said, he once showed this to Wordsworth, who took it in one hand, then drew out his own watch, and held it up with the other before the company, but no one making the expected remark he put back his own in silence. I do not attach much importance to the disparagement of Wordsworth among London scholars. Who reads him well will know, that in following the strong bent of his genius, he was careless of the many, careless also of the few, self-assured that he should "create the taste by which he is to be enjoyed." He lived long enough to witness the revolution he had wrought, and "to see what he foresaw." There are torpid places in his mind, there is something hard and sterile in his poetry, want of grace and variety, want of due catholicity and cosmopolitan scope: he had conformities to English politics and traditions; he had egotistic puerilities in the choice and treatment of his subjects; but let us say of him, that alone in his time he treated the human mind well, and with an absolute trust. His adherence to his poetic creed rested on real inspirations. The Ode on Immortality is the high-water-mark which the intellect has reached at this age. New means were employed, and new realms added to the empire of the muse, by his courage.—*From "English Traits."*

RUSSIAN CROWN DIAMONDS.

The crown treasury of the Czars at Moscow contains precious stones of considerable amount. The two most considerable are diamonds, one of the size of a pigeon's egg, cut in rose. The Russians have given it the name of the Orloff. The other has the form of an irregular prism, and is of the size, and almost the length, of a little finger; it bears the name of the Shali, and its history is as follows: It formerly belonged to the Sophis, and was one of the two enormous diamonds which ornamented the throne of Nadir Shah, and which were designated by the Persians by the names of Sun of the Sea and Moon of the Mountains. When Nadir was assassinated his treasures were pillaged, and his precious stones divided among a few soldiers, who carefully concealed them. An Armenian, by the name of Shafras, resided at that period at Bassora, with his two brothers. One day an Affghan came to him and offered for sale the large diamond, the Moon of the Mountains, as well as an emerald, a ruby of fabulous size, a sapphire of the finest water, called by the Persians "The Eye of Allah," and other stones, for the whole of which he asked such a moderate sum that Shafras suspected that they had not been honestly come by, and told him to call again, as he had not the money in the house. The Affghan, fearing that Shafras was going to act with treachery toward him, left the place, and could not be found, although the brothers made every search for him. Some years afterward the elder brother met the man at Bagdad, who told him that he had just sold all his precious stones for sixty-five thousand piastres, and a pair of valuable horses. Shafras had the residence of the purchaser, who was a Jew, pointed out to him, and he went to him, and offered him double the price he had given for them, but was refused. The three brothers then agreed to murder the Jew, and rob him of his purchase, which they did, and on the following day poisoned the Affghan, and threw both the bodies into the river. A dispute soon after arose between the brothers as to the division of the spoil, which terminated in Shafras getting rid of his two brothers by poison, after which he fled to Constantinople, and thence to Holland, where he made known the riches he possessed, and offered them for sale to the different courts of Europe. Catharine II. proposed to buy the Moon of the Mountains only. Shafras was requested to come to Russia, and he was introduced to the court jeweller. The terms demanded by Shafras were: Letters of nobility, a life annuity of ten thousand roubles, and five hundred thousand roubles, payable by equal instalments in ten years. Count Panin, who was then minister, delayed the settlement of the bargain as long as possible, and in the meantime had the Armenian led into such extravagances that he fell into debt, and when the minister found that he had no means of paying what he owed, he abruptly broke off the negotiation. Shafras, according to the laws of the country, could not leave until his debts should be paid, and the court jeweller prepared to take advantage of his embarrassments, and intended that the diamond should fall into his hands for a fourth part of its value. Shafras, however, discovered the trap that had been laid for him, and disposing of some of the less valuable stones among his countrymen, paid his debts, and disappeared. Agents were sent after him, who had even orders to assassinate and rob him, but he escaped them. Ten years after, while he was at Astraken, renewed offers were made to him, but he refused to enter into negotiations, unless the bargain should be settled at Smyrna. Catharine accepted, and became the possessor of the diamond for letters of nobility, six hundred thousand roubles, and one hundred and seventy thousand paper roubles (making, together, about two and a half millions of francs). Shafras, not being able to return to his country, where he would have had to give an account of two homicides and two fratricides, fixed himself at Astrakan, where he married a countrywoman of his, and had seven daughters. One of his sons-in-law poisoned him for the sake of possessing his share of his property. The immense fortune which the murderer had acquired (from ten to twelve millions) was divided, and soon spent by his successors, and several of the grandchildren of Shafras are now living at Astrakan in abject misery.

RELIGIOUS FERVOUR OF THE AFRICAN RACE.

[In a speech of the Rev. Mr. Jobson, a recent delegate from the English Wesleyans to this country, before the British Wesleyan Conference, he gives the following interesting account of a service held in a church in Baltimore.]

His (Mr. Jobson's) services among the coloured people had been spoken of; and certainly the service with them at Baltimore was the most intensely interesting service he had ever known. He would not speak of it in detail. (Cries of "Go on!" and "Speak.") Then, if I must, I would say it was a service I sought and requested; for wherever I went the sight of the coloured people moved me greatly; my bowels yearned over them; and there were times when, viewing them and reflecting upon their long-oppressed and degraded condition, I experienced feelings that are indescribable; feelings which, unworthy as I am to think or say so, seemed in some distant degree to resemble the pitying and compassionate feelings of Jesus Christ toward mankind, and I felt as though I could not live unless I had the opportunity of pouring out my heart to that injured and abused people, in preaching to them the Gospel of the Son of God (hear, hear). Our friends in Baltimore afforded me this high privilege, and gave to me the large African church in Sharpe street, on a Sabbath evening. The church was crowded with coloured persons. It was said there were two thousand of them there; say fifteen hundred, for large numbers in congregations are usually over-estimated. The church, however, was crowded in all parts, and many went away, unable to gain admission. There were pews and sittings, but these were not made of much account; the people seemed literally jammed together. And O, the sight of those black, beaming faces, those thousands of upturned negro imploring eyes! for, as my brethren, the returned missionaries, will bear witness, there is a peculiar devotional look in the eye of a worshiping negro, that cannot be described (hear, hear). When I looked upon them I fully realized the meaning of old Thomas Fuller's saying concerning the dark-coloured race: "God's children, carved in ebony." Their singing was most fervent and harmonious, such as belongs only to African voices, and their prayers were devout and earnest. I preached to them on the freeness and fullness of Gospel salvation, sounding forth to them the good news of the great Gospel supper provided for the poor, the maimed, the halt, the blind, and for the unsheltered outcasts of men in the highways and hedges of human society. And if I must speak of myself, as I am forced to do in this case, then I would say, I preached with all my heart and life, and until nature was wrung to its very withers with intensity of feeling. The scene, as it spread itself before me, was in a mere picturesque aspect most exciting and inspiring. There were some hundreds of slaves there, and many who were free. Some of the freemen were clothed in superfine black broadcloth, and with an excess of white collar and wristband. Within the communion rails sat some twenty black, woolly headed local preachers and deacons, well dressed, and with white neckerchiefs of the old Methodist form. Some of the females had on the African turban, in colours of red, and blue, and yellow; others, of the free class, had on the European bonnet, and were clothed in rich white muslins and silks. But beyond the general aspect of the congregation, the presence and power of God were there, and the effects were most striking. For a time the people kept silent, except that now and then arose, in different parts of the church, an exclamation, such as, "Blessed be de name of Jesus!" "Hallelujah to de Lamb!" and their black faces beamed and shone again with religious rapture. At length they began to move and heave like waves of the sea. Then the floods lifted up their voice and clapped their hands; then their mouth was filled with laughter, and their tongue with singing; and at length, clearing spaces around them, they literally leaped up from the ground as high as this platform, and danced for joy (hear, hear). But in all this there was nothing irreverent or undevout, and nothing to confuse or confound the preacher. They made two collections in that service, for our coloured brethren have no idea of appearing before the Lord empty; and after the second collection we tried to dismiss the congregation, but they would not depart. They would still sing and praise God. And I too had difficulty in getting out of the church. Black hands were thrust forth to me in all directions, accompanied with expressions such as, "Bless you, English massa! and bless the great Massa in beben for the word which you bring!" It was, indeed, a memorable service; my most memorable service in the work of Christ; such as verbal description can never make known (great sensation).

THE DIGHTON ROCK AND RUNIC INSCRIPTION.

At the meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, Dr. Hamlin, of Maine, read a paper on some supposed Runic inscriptions deeply cut into a rock on the coast of that State, of which he exhibited copies and casts.

The discovery of these inscriptions, if they should prove to be Runic, will be strong additional evidence that the Northmen visited the New England coast, long anterior to the discovery of America by Columbus, and strengthen the claim set up by antiquaries that these people passed one or more Winters within the waters of Narragansett Bay. No one, we believe, questions the antiquity and genuineness of the ancient Icelandic Sagas, wherein the voyages of the Northmen are given, and which are accompanied by such geographical details as enable scholars to follow their track and identify certain portions of the coasts of Newfoundland and New England, which they saw and described. These details are quite sufficient of themselves to prove that the voyagers visited our coast, without bringing into the question the inscription on the Dighton Rock, or the Old Stone Mill at Newport, neither of which, in our opinion, have any connection with the Northmen. We think, too, that the desire of some over-zealous antiquaries to bring these ancient memorials in as corroborative facts to prove the visit of the ancient people to our waters, has injured, rather than strengthened the claim.

The reading of Dr. Hamlin's paper elicited remarks from several gentleman of the association, among them from Dr. Wilson, of Canada, who had seen and copied the inscriptions referred to, the importance of which all acknowledged. It is stated that they were cut very deep in the rock with a sharp instrument, but there was no one present who was able to determine whether or not the characters were Runic. Mr. Schoolcraft, than whom no one is more familiar with the Indian figures and signs, declared that the Maine inscriptions bore no resemblance to the Algonquin figures. It was also stated that a few years since, there were discovered on the coast of Maine, the remains of chimneys and other evidences that some foreigners had visited it at a very remote period, as the spot was now covered with large forest trees. As the Indians never built chimneys, or left any durable traces of their habitations, there is every reason to suppose that the remains referred to were the work of some foreign people.

The Dighton Rock was also discussed on the occasion referred to, but no one came forward to advocate its claim as a work of the ancient Vikings of the North; although it was stated that there were certain marks on it, among the ruder figures (the Indian origin of which is too evident), which bore considerable resemblance to Runic characters. Several Runic inscriptions have been found in Greenland, as well as the remains of a stone church, all of which go to sustain the evidence recorded in the Icelandic Sagas, of the occupation of that country in the tenth and subsequent centuries. Another and equally important inscription, in the same ancient character, was discovered, a few years since, by a whaling ship, on the coast near the entrance to Lansaster Sound, at the head of Baffin's Bay, with a well-defined date of the twelfth century (we think about the year 1150), and the record of a visit there at that time.

All these go to show that the Northmen did visit our extreme northern shores at an early period; and we feel a curiosity to know what the antiquaries of Copenhagen, to whom copies and casts of the Maine inscriptions have been sent, will say of them.—*Providence Journal.*

Gleanings from Foreign Publications.

There is some fresh rumours of the progress of the potato blight in Ireland, which in several places has attacked the tubers.

——Miss Jessie Meriton White has applied at King's-College, London, to become a candidate for the degree of bachelor of medicine. The senate have submitted the case for the opinion of counsel.

——A Fanatic.—A letter from Rome announces the death of Prince Charles Doria, who every year was accustomed to distribute a sum of 40,000f. in alms. Not content with what he gave himself, he used to go bare-footed, dressed in coarse sackcloth, with a thick cord round his waist, about the streets, imploring charity.

——Mrs. Stowe in Glasgow.—Mr. and Mrs. Beecher Stowe, accompanied by their son and two daughters, and by a sister of the distinguished authoress, arrived in Glasgow on Tuesday night, by the Caledonian railway, and took up their residence in the Star hotel, Buchanan street. On Friday they made an excursion to Bothwell-Castle, after which they paid a visit to the West End Park. Mrs. Stowe and daughters left Glasgow on Saturday morning, by the Lochgoil steamer, *en route* for Inverary—Mrs. Stowe on a visit to the Duke and Duchess of Argyll, and the rest of the party to sojourn either at Lochgoil Head, or some other watering-place. Mr. Stowe is, we believe, to start for America on Tuesday next, but his "better half" and family purpose remaining for some little time on this side of the Atlantic.—*Glasgow Commonwealth.*

——"The Grand Council of Geneva has lately commuted the sentence of death recorded against a girl named Pierrette Brunet, guilty of poisoning, to hard labour for life. The Grand Council acted in deference to the aversion entertained in Geneva against capital punishment. It appears that the last instance of capital punishment in that town occurred in 1847, when it was with the utmost difficulty that a workman could be found to erect a guillotine. A man at length consented for a remuneration of 300fr. After